United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2016 *No. 99*

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARRET GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Without a future, as a people, we are depressed and limited in creative imaging. Without a past, we are inexperienced and lost between success and failure.

Be as present to this Nation today as You were to our Founders. As the Creator and providential Lord, guide the Members of this people's House and all their efforts to uphold the Constitution and have it interface with present realities until true priorities arise as the Nation's agenda.

Stir within all Americans a solidarity that will always unite and never divide us. Renew in us a spirit that will enable this country to be a righteous leader into a bold future, shaping a new culture of collaboration and understanding for the 21st century.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. TORRES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY CELEBRATES 200 YEARS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 200th anniversary of the American Bible Society, an organization that works to make the Bible available to every person in a language and format each can understand and afford so all people may experience its life-changing message.

Our forefathers knew well the value of casting our burdens on God and prayer and that, above all, this Nation needed a moral and spiritual foundation in order to survive and thrive. It is why some of them were also the first leaders of the American Bible Society, including Elias Boudinot, the first president of the Continental Congress; and John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

From its beginnings distributing Bibles to members of the military to publishing the first Bible in braille to recently launching a library of digital Bible translations, the American Bible Society has changed lives by sharing God's word.

Congratulations on this important milestone.

NBA CHAMPIONS CLEVELAND CAVALIERS

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, as I stand in my wine and gold and black today, I quote the words of LeBron James, in Cleveland, ''nothing is given. Everything is earned.''

I rise today to congratulate our 2016 NBA champions, the Cleveland Cavaliers. They earned it.

Facing a 3–1 series deficit, the Cavaliers beat all the odds. Led by LeBron James, the team quieted all doubters and brought home the Larry O'Brien Trophy.

It was historic, something that had never been done in the history of the NBA. Cleveland's victory ended the

city's 52-year championship drought, the longest in professional sports history.

No city has witnessed as many heartbreaking moments in sports. But not this time, Mr. Speaker. This time, it was our time. Over those 52 years, our fans never wavered, never lost hope. We always believed.

Mr. Speaker, the wait is over. Victory is ours. Congratulations to the NBA world champion Cleveland Cavaliers.

ISLAMIC TERRORIST GLOBAL THREAT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reported Friday the global reach of the Islamic State. This clearly clarifies we are in a global war on terrorism, confirming we must defeat Islamic terrorists overseas or they will murder here again, as they did in Orlando and San Bernardino.

The article reveals:

''The U.S. battle against the Islamic State has not yet curbed the group's global reach and as pressure mounts on the extremists in Iraq and Syria, they are expected to plot more attacks on the West and incite violence by lone wolves, CIA Director John Brennan told Congress.

''In a rare open hearing, Brennan gave the Senate Intelligence Committee an update on the threat from Islamic extremists . . . 'ISIL has a cadre of Western fighters who could potentially serve as operatives for attacks in the West' . . . 'Furthermore, as we have seen in Orlando, San Bernardino and elsewhere, ISIL is attempting to inspire attacks by sympathizers who have no direct links to the group.' . . . 'our efforts have not reduced the group's terrorism capability and global reach.' ''

In conclusion, God bless our troops and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CLOSE A DANGEROUS LOOPHOLE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has no greater responsibility than acting to keep the American people safe. That is why House Democrats, focused on a strong and smart national security plan, have repeatedly made attempts to close a dangerous loophole that allows suspected terrorists to buy deadly weapons, weapons like those that we just saw used in the horrific mass shooting in Orlando.

Eighty percent of Americans, an overwhelming majority, support a law that would prevent people on the FBI's terrorist watch list from being able to buy guns. For the American people, it is common sense. It is a no-brainer.

Yet Republicans in Congress continue to do everything they can to stop us not just from acting, but to stop us from even having a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives as to whether this legislation ought to go forward. In the Senate, they have blocked efforts—they just did yesterday—to bring up this commonsense legislation.

Speaker RYAN and House Republicans continue to keep us from bringing up a bill authored by one of the Republican Members of this House that would prevent an individual on the terrorist watch list from buying a gun.

It is long past time. Congress needs to act.

HELPING MINNESOTA'S YOUTH

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address childhood obesity in the recent efforts in Minnesota, my home State, to address this concern for families throughout our State and across this country.

Over the past decade, as a nation, we have seen a great deal of time and energy dedicated to combatting childhood obesity, and thus far, we have seen great successes.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation recently highlighted St. Cloud, the largest city in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, because of an impressive 24 percent decline in obesity for 12-year-olds over the past 7 years. This incredible shift in the health and well-being for Minnesota's youth could not have occurred without joint community effort.

As an example, in St. Cloud, we have been lucky enough to have the help of healthcare providers like CentraCare, who look past the boundaries of their hospitals and their clinics and bring their work into the communities where they live.

I applaud the efforts of great Minnesota companies and organizations like CentraCare, Coborn's, Bernick's, and many others who are dedicated to working together to improve the overall health in our Minnesota communities.

HUWALDT 80TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Harrison and Varedo Huwaldt of Randolph, Nebraska, celebrating their 80th wedding anniversary today, June 21, 2016. Yes, that is 80 years together. After meeting on a blind date in 1935, the Huwaldts married within a year and began their life together.

During their 80 years of marriage, they have visited all 50 States, operated their own filling station and a trucking business, and enjoyed water skiing, golfing, and taking cruises together. They have three children, six grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

They have also been active members in their community. Harrison served on the city council for more than 50 years, while Varedo served as church organist for 25 years.

Now, at the ages of 100 and 99, respectively, the Huwaldt's eight-decade commitment to each other inspires all who hear their love story. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Harrison and Varedo Huwaldt on their remarkable 80 years of marriage.

REPORT ON H.R. 5538, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. CALVERT from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–632) on the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

END TAXPAYER FUNDED CELL PHONES ACT OF 2016

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5525) to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5525

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON LIFELINE SUPPORT FOR MOBILE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on January 1, 2017, a provider of commercial mobile service or commercial mobile data service may not receive universal service support under sections 214(e) and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e); 254) for the provision of such service through the Lifeline program of the Federal Communications Commission.

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS.—For calendar year 2017, the amount that telecommunications carriers that provide interstate telecommunications services and other providers of interstate telecommunications are required to contribute under section 254(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 to Federal universal service support mechanisms shall be determined—

(1) without regard to subsection (a); and

(2) as if the same amount of support for the provision of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program that is provided in calendar year 2016 is provided in calendar year 2017.

(c) EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—The amount collected pursuant to subsection (b)(2) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, for the sole purpose of deficit reduction. No portion of such amount may be treated as a credit toward future contributions required under section 254(d) of the Communications Act of 1934.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMERCIAL MOBILE DATA SERVICE.—The term ''commercial mobile data service'' has the meaning given such term in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401).

(2) COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE.—The term ''commercial mobile service'' has the meaning given such term in section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5525, the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016, which would prohibit universal service fund support through the Lifeline program to commercial mobile and data service carriers.

This legislation would restore the Lifeline program to its original intent of providing access to telecommunication services for eligible individuals via landline phones.

Many of us in this body and many of our constituents have witnessed tents and stands outside of our grocery stores or on the street corner giving away so-called free phones. At a time when everyday Americans are working harder and harder to make ends meet and when government spending is out of control, our constituents don't understand why this is still going on. And, Mr. Speaker, neither do I.

Before I go further, I want to be clear. These Americans who accept these free phones are not the ones who are taking advantage of this system. It is the carriers who stand to benefit from the system that are taking advantage of our citizens, and the program is systemically unable to stop the cycle of waste, fraud, and abuse.

When offered something for free with little or no verification and with little or no knowledge about who is paying for that item, I believe you would be hard pressed to find someone who wouldn't, at least, consider taking the item. The problem is that there is a financial incentive for the carriers to expand the number of Lifeline users, and there is far less incentive to diligently verify the eligibility of the individuals who apply.

The Lifeline program, created under President Reagan to serve a legitimate need, has largely gone unchecked and has ballooned since 2005, when it was expanded to include mobile phone services.

While the FCC has implemented reforms aimed at rooting out the waste, fraud, and abuse in the program, serious issues remain to this day. For example, the National Lifeline Accountability Database was created to help carriers prevent duplication of service. However, certain carriers use the independent economic household override to easily circumvent the one-phone-number-per-household rule by merely checking the box on a form without any supporting documentation.

Data recently obtained by the FCC reveals that between October of 2014 and April of 2016, carriers enrolled 4,291,647 duplicate subscribers to the Lifeline program by widespread use of this targeted exception to the program's one-person household rule. When skirting the rules is so easy, fraud becomes rampant.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, the FCC fined a carrier, Total Call Mobile, for overbilling the Lifeline program for millions of dollars by fraudulently enrolling duplicate and ineligible consumers. Again, the carrier, Total Call Mobile, was able to do this by circumventing the National Lifeline Accountability Database and manipulating customer information.

These reports come on the heels of the FCC's recent announcement to increase the so-called budget for Lifeline by $725 million, a tax increase on Americans which is neither subject to congressional oversight nor approval.

□ 1415

While the widespread fraud is not hindering eligible recipients from receiving phones, it is costing taxpaying Americans money. In order to increase the Lifeline budget, if you will, the FCC must increase the universal service fee. I bet most Americans don't know what fee I am talking about.

The universal service fee is a tax on the bottom of your phone bill right here. That so-called fee is what pays for the FCC's Universal Service Fund, which includes the Lifeline program.

When the costs of the Lifeline program go up because of waste, fraud, and abuse, you know who pays for it?

Everyday Americans, who are already struggling to make ends meet, get a tax increase on their phone bill.

The FCC is asking for Americans to shoulder the cost of this increase without fully addressing the fraud, waste, and abuse within the program. It is clear that this lack of accountability and rampant fraud is systemic to the Lifeline program, and the price of this continues to be paid by Americans across the country.

American taxpayers are already overburdened, Mr. Speaker, and should not be forced to pay for a program that is unquestionably riddled with waste, fraud, and abuse. It is simple good governance to rein in programs like Lifeline that have vastly expanded in scope and have done so with an ever-increasing share of Americans' hard-earned dollars. Congress must act to impose fiscal discipline to ensure increased costs are not shouldered by Americans.

I do not stand here today and say that there is not a need for Lifeline, nor do I deny the fact that there are a good number of people in this country who are eligible for this program. We should continue to ensure that the Lifeline program exists to provide those people with access to critical telecommunications services, but we should also remember the many people making just barely enough not to be eligible for assistance through Lifeline who would be hurt by any increase in the taxes on their phone bill: an increase caused by a government that won't deal with the crisis of waste, fraud, and abuse.

The original intent of the Lifeline program was pure: provide access to telecommunications services to consumers, including low-income consumers at reasonable and affordable rates. My legislation aims to restore that original intent. We can provide for people in need without taking from those who have nothing left to give.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5525. A few weeks ago when Speaker RYAN presented his anti-poverty plan, many of us were skeptical and argued that his proposals would not actually help the poor. The Ryan plan was simply a rebranding of failed policies that congressional Republicans have been pushing for years.

Unfortunately, we are quickly finding out that our fears were justified, Mr. Speaker. Today, Speaker RYAN and the Republican majority are bringing a bill to the floor that would eliminate the successful Lifeline program that provides millions of low-income Americans access to basic communication services. It would leave people with no way to search for job postings, no way to schedule interviews, and no way to get a call back from a potential employer.

This goes far beyond jobs, Mr. Speaker. Cell phones are a necessity in modern, everyday life. Low-income Americans rely more heavily on mobile phones and mobile Internet service than the overall population. Children from low-income homes use Lifeline to help do their homework. Seniors use it to manage their health care and call their family and loved ones. Victims of domestic violence use it to find the help and support they need, and victims of assaults use their Lifeline phones to call 911 in an emergency, which makes me question how exactly this bill fits into Speaker RYAN's anti-poverty agenda.

The legislation is so extreme when you consider that congressional Republicans are looking to gut a Lifeline program created in the Reagan administration and expanded to include wireless service in the Bush administration. At least 9.8 million Americans depend on the Lifeline program to stay connected using mobile phones, and this bill would leave these people stranded.

Some claim that the program is fraught with government waste. I heard that from the gentleman from Georgia. But these claims ignore the fact that the Obama administration has eliminated nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in waste, fraud, and abuse.

This bill will do absolutely nothing to help taxpayers. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill would essentially create a $1.2 billion tax. Specifically, the bill directs the FCC to continue collecting funds from the American people that had been used for the Lifeline program, but not pay any benefits out. Rather than cut taxes, this bill essentially creates a new one.

When it comes down to it, congressional Republicans already know there are significant problems with this bill. They don't want it to pass. That is the only way to explain why they came up with this cynical procedural move to ignore regular order and set up the bill to fail. They are bringing it up under a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds majority. They think that the American people will not hold them accountable for their bad policies if they let Democrats kill the bill.

Worse, this maneuver comes from a committee that normally obsesses with process for the agencies in our jurisdiction. It seems those concerns apply only to others. Well, I think more highly of our constituents. I think they see through these kinds of ploys.

The American people know that if Republicans are really serious about battling poverty and shrinking the size of Lifeline, they would work with us to create more jobs for those who are unemployed or underemployed. The best way to lower the costs of the Lifeline program is to lift people up and not to take away their connection to a better life.

We should not be spending our time on bills like this. We could be looking at ways to take guns from terrorists instead of taking phones from Americans who are looking for jobs. We could be working together to increase the minimum wage and repair our crumbling infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, this bill abandons our most vulnerable, and I urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we are on the floor for a very important question, and the question is: Will Congress ignore knowledge of some $476 million that is considered documented fraud that is taking place on behalf of taxpayers of the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, a letter from Commissioner Pai at the Federal Communications Commission dated June 8, 2016—not even a month ago—goes to Mr. Chris Henderson, chief executive officer, Universal Service Administrative Company of the United States. It documents abuse in here, and I would read if I may:

''Thank you again for your May 25 letter, which contained detailed data on how wireless resellers have used the National Lifeline Accountability Database. My staff has concluded further analysis of that data, and I am now concerned that the abuse of the Universal Service Fund's Lifeline program is more widespread than I first thought.''

Mr. Speaker, Mr. SCOTT is here on the floor today to protect the taxpayers of this country and the integrity of the laws that we have passed and that we have oversight of by virtue of being Members of Congress. The $476 million is a problem because it is documented that it is duplicate use by organizations that have been fined over $50 million by the FCC.

In no way is Mr. SCOTT or this legislation attempting to take away Lifeline service that is very important to not only members particularly in rural areas, but other areas of the United States to provide them access to broadband that has been created by our American ingenuity. I would note, however, that what we are doing is that we do not believe the government has any business in funding the fraud that has been made available.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the original Labs team out of New Jersey that developed broadband in the mid-1980s. I was on the original team that brought forth this product to the American people, and it was done with great anticipation to help better people's lives, to allow all areas of the United States—and probably the world—to better connect itself for the new transitional world that we would live in.

I don't think it was ever envisioned that we would want it to be misused in such a way that it would cost taxpayers of this country $500 million a year in fraud. It is there as an advocate for people to gain jobs, to understand education better, and to use the avenues of technology to better their lives.

Where you have documented fraud, the United States Congress has a responsibility to stand up. I believe that is what we are saying today. By this suspension vote, we are expecting two-thirds of this body to recognize that where there is widespread fraud that the United States Congress, on behalf of the taxpayer who paid the bill for the fraud, that something responsible would be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from Commissioner Pai. I would ask, more importantly, that this Congress be responsible about saying it is documented fraud that we are after, not Lifeline service.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

Mr. CHRIS HENDERSON,
Chief Executive Officer, Universal Service Administrative Company, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Thank you again for your May 25 letter, which contained detailed data on how wireless resellers have used the National Lifeline Accountability Database (NLAD). My staff has concluded further analysis of that data, and I am now concerned that abuse of the Universal Service Fund's Lifeline program is more widespread than I first thought.

Before 2012, it was well known that duplicate subscribers (that is, individuals getting multiple subsidies) plagued the Lifeline program. In the 2012 Lifeline Reform Order, the Commission codified the one-per-household rule, which prohibits more than one Lifeline subscription from going to a single household. To curb the problem of duplicate subscriptions and enforce the one-per-household rule, the FCC established the NLAD. The NLAD is designed to help carriers identify and resolve duplicate claims for Lifeline service and prevent future duplicates from enrolling.

Although the NLAD rejects multiple subscribers at the same address, the FCC also instructed USAC to ''implement procedures to enable applicants to demonstrate at the outset that any other Lifeline recipients residing at their residential address are part of a separate household.'' USAC did so by allowing carriers to override NLAD's rejection of an applicant with the same address as another subscriber. As USAC's website explains, to carry out an independent economic household (IEH) override (as USAC calls it), an applicant must merely check a box on a form and need not provide any supporting documentation.

Unfortunately, this well-intentioned exception to the override process appears to be undermining the one-per-household rule. The NLAD is not preventing a large number of duplicate subscribers from claiming Lifeline subsidies.

We saw in the Total Call Mobile case how unscrupulous carriers could regularly register duplicate subscribers by fraudulently using the address of a local homeless shelter, altering a person's name, and using fake Social Security numbers to evade detection. As a result, USAC had to de-enroll 32,498 duplicates from Total Call Mobile's rolls.

But your May 25 letter reveals an even greater problem. Specifically, USAC's data reveal that Carriers enrolled 4,291,647 subscribers between October 2014 and April 2016 using the IEH override process. That's more than 35.3% of all subscribers enrolled in

NLAD-participating states during that period. Indeed, that's more people than live in the State of Oregon. And the price to the taxpayer is steep—just one year of service for these apparent duplicates costs taxpayers $476 million.

It is alarming that over one-third of subscribers—costing taxpayers almost half a billion dollars a year—were registered through an IEH override. Therefore, I respectfully request that you provide the following information to my office:

1. Of the 4,291,647 subscribers enrolled using an IEH override between October 2014 and April 2016, how many are still enrolled in the Lifeline program? To the extent these subscribers are no longer enrolled, please quantify (1) how many subscribers left the program of their own volition, (2) how many deenrolled as a result of a specific investigation, audit, or review, and (3) how many deenrolled as a result of annual verification checks.

2. Please explain the process USAC used to establish the current IEH override process. Specifically, please explain why carriers are not required to collect any documentation demonstrating that a subscriber is ''part of a separate household'' for purposes of an IEH override and why staff do not review either the certification form or any documentation before authorizing an IEH override.

3. Please describe the steps USAC has taken to verify the integrity of the IEH override process. Specifically, I am interested in understanding the steps taken to verify that subscribers enrolled with an IEH override are in fact economically independent from other Lifeline subscribers at the same address.

a. For example, one Total Call Mobile sales agent testified that he filled out applications, checking off the boxes he knew applicants needed to check to enroll. What process does USAC use to minimize and detect such behavior?

b. Does USAC contact existing subscribers at a particular address before enrolling a new subscriber at that address to verify economic independence?

c. Has USAC sampled a set of subscribers to determine whether subscribers can demonstrate economic independence through documentation (such as tax forms)?

d. Has USAC coordinated with federal or state agencies to determine whether subscribers have consistently represented themselves as economically independent?

4. According to the 2014 Lifeline Biennial Audit Plan, independent auditors were required to create a list of apparent duplicates for each carrier subject to the audit and verify for a sample of 30 apparent duplicates that ''at least one subscriber at each address [has] complete[d] a one-per-household worksheet.'' Were auditors required to verify whether such subscribers were actually economically independent from other Lifeline subscribers at the same address for a sample of apparent duplicates? If not, why not?

5. Please describe any investigations, audits, or reviews that USAC has conducted from October 2014 to the present to verify that subscribers enrolled with an IEH override are in fact economically independent from other Lifeline subscribers at their address. Please include any such reports drafted or issued by USAC or, in the case of no such report, a summary of USAC's findings.

6. Please describe any recommendations USAC has to improve the IEH override process to ensure that taxpayer funds are not wasted. Please identify any FCC rule changes that would be necessary to effectuate such improvements.

7. You reported in your May 2 letter that USAC also conducts Payment Quality Assurance (PQA) reviews and regularly analyzes the NLAD for ''anomalies, duplicates, or other errors that may signal improper payments of potentially fraudulent behavior.'' As a result of those reviews, USAC discovered and de-enrolled 373,911 duplicates from the NLAD between February and May 2015. Please describe any other investigations, audits, or reviews that USAC has conducted from October 2014 to the present to eliminate duplicate subscribers from the NLAD. Please include any such reports drafted or issued by USAC or, in the case of no such report, a summary of USAC's findings.

8. In the Total Call Mobile case, one sales agent alleged that he could enroll the same person multiple times in the NLAD so long as the applicant used different devices within a 15-minute timespan. Is this claim true? If so, what steps will USAC take to close this apparent loophole?

I appreciate USAC's continued work to protect the American taxpayer and safeguard the Universal Service Fund. I also appreciate that USAC often takes instruction from the FCC in fulfilling its role. Given the hundreds of millions in taxpayer funds apparently lost to unscrupulous behavior in the Lifeline program, I hope you will agree that USAC's paramount task must be to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse from the Lifeline program. I therefore ask that you respond with the requested information by July 28, 2016. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

AJIT PAI,
Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the ranking member from New Jersey for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5525, a bill that undermines the Lifeline program and demonstrates the majority's continued indifference to the struggle of low-income Americans.

The Lifeline program helps 9.8 million people across this country access cell phone service which, as we all know, is a necessity for modern everyday life. For decades, helping struggling Americans access basic technology was a bipartisan initiative. It was started under President Reagan, and then expanded under President George W. Bush. I am surprised and disappointed that my Republican colleagues have chosen today to end that tradition of bipartisanship on behalf of struggling families.

Let's be clear, a vote for this bill is a vote to take critical devices away from people who need them the most. We are taking service away from older Americans who use it to manage their health care and call their loved ones. We are taking service away from students who use cell data to do their homework. We are taking service away from victims of domestic violence who use it to get help and support. We are taking service away from unemployed workers who use it to find a good-paying job. Most importantly, we are taking devices out of the hands of Americans who use Lifeline to call 911 during an emergency.

Why?

The majority says it will save consumers money, but the way that the bill is written, it will not save a dime for consumers or American taxpayers. We continue to collect the fees, but we do not provide Lifeline services. This legislation will do one thing and only one thing: Make it harder for low-income Americans to get back on their feet.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 5525.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT for allowing me time to speak on this.

Obviously, I rise today in support of H.R. 5525, the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016.

This administration has continued to expand existing programs for their own political benefit, with one of the most glaring examples being the ''Obama phone,'' also known as the Lifeline program. This was created back in the 1980s. Lifeline brought telecommunication services to consumers, including those with low income.

While this program started with good intentions, like most programs do, the Lifeline program has spiraled out of control, and the budget for this program is growing astronomically.

In an effort to curb wasteful spending, I am proud to support my colleague from Georgia's legislation. It is a commonsense approach to reining in wasteful spending in Washington. Americans are tired of the Federal Government spending taxpayer money that is not accounted for, and this bill is a step in the right direction.

Americans watch their money, and Washington should too. This legislation restores the Lifeline program back to its original purpose and narrows its scope to cut fraud and abuse, which has been mentioned multiple times here this morning. We have to put an end to bloated bureaucracy one Federal program at a time.

□ 1430

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was a 911 dispatcher for 17½ years in Los Angeles. It used to be that, when we had land lines, you didn't have to be a subscriber to telephone service to be able to dial 911 for police emergencies, fire emergencies, or paramedic services. People could simply keep their phone plugged in and be able to dial 911.

That is no longer the case, as more and more phone companies are doing away with land lines. More and more people now have to subscribe to telephone service in order to be able to access 911 for paramedics, for a police emergency, or for a fire service emergency.

So we have created a system that is working against the poorest of the poor in our communities, and now the Republicans want to take that away from them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this. Allow the people in the United States to be able to access an ambulance, a police officer, or a firefighter for free. The poorest of the poor are depending on you to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a couple of things that were said from the start.

First of all, this piece of legislation does not eliminate the Lifeline program. It does move it back to land lines and away from the cellular services.

I would also, respectfully, submit that multiple pieces of legislation have been introduced in an effort to address the waste, fraud, and abuse in this program. The number that I mentioned earlier—4,291,647—is cases where we believe there has been an abuse of the system. The phone companies get approximately $10 a month per phone that they hand out. That is a tremendous amount of waste, fraud, and abuse. It is almost $500 million.

So when we see that much waste, fraud, and abuse in the system, we as a Congress have a responsibility to put the integrity back into that system.

There have been a tremendous number of pieces of legislation that have been introduced. They have all not been able to come to the floor. I want to thank our leadership for putting a bill on the floor that does the one thing in attempting to eliminate that waste, fraud, and abuse of this system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some of the points that the gentleman from Georgia made.

First of all, 85 percent of the program goes toward wireless service; mobile phones. So when the gentleman says that we are eliminating wireless and that it doesn't matter because we will go back to land lines, that is just simply not the case. That is what the gentlewoman from California just explained.

I am concerned that what I am really hearing from the gentleman from Georgia is the notion that somehow, if there are more than two lines at a given address, it is fraud. I just want to eliminate that notion because I think that criticism misses the point.

There is an exception in the Lifeline program that can permit more than one line per household. This exception is a critical feature that allows people without a long-term home address to take advantage of the program. These are the very people Lifeline was designed to help.

The system allows those living in a homeless shelter, without a stable address, to have access to a phone. It even allows veterans in a group home to access the Internet. So it is not fraud to allow these people access to phones because they happen to have the same address.

While this particular feature of the program may not be the cause of harm that has been alleged, Democrats are serious about eliminating the waste, fraud, and abuse from the Lifeline program. We stand ready to work with Republicans to make the program better.

When we had a hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the points we were making was, just cutting the program doesn't eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. You understand, this bill simply says we are going to cut the funds. It doesn't say how that is going to eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse.

I will tell you there never was a markup. It just came to the floor. We did have a hearing. There was no markup. So this is not regular order. But the bottom line is, we said over and over again, as Democrats: work with us to eliminate the fraud and abuse. The Obama administration has always done that.

This doesn't do that. This just cuts the program and goes back to what my two colleagues from California were saying: you now have all these people who are poor and working people, who don't have enough money to pay for these phones. They just don't have the phone anymore, and so they don't have access to a mobile phone in order to make those critical calls for some of the purposes that were mentioned.

As I said, during the Obama administration, the FCC has already reduced expenditures by nearly a billion dollars. In fact, the FCC recently took additional substantial steps to prevent potential abuses of the program. The FCC very recently created an independent, third-party National Lifeline Eligibility Verifier. So there is a singular, disinterested referee making Lifeline eligibility decisions.

So an effort is being made—a serious effort—that has already saved a lot of money to try to improve this program. But, again, the bill before us does nothing to target waste, fraud, or abuse. It just cuts off truly deserving low-income Americans from a program that can help them improve their lives.

So for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

In closing, I don't want to keep repeating the same thing, but I think it is pretty clear where I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle stand. This bill would cut off millions of low-income persons from having wireless service and access to the Internet. If enacted, it would prohibit commercial wireless providers from receiving money from the Universal Service Fund Lifeline program, and that program subsidizes phones for low-income Americans. Without this program, millions of Americans will be left stranded, without any phones.

The bill is being brought to the floor under suspension of the rules, even though no committee has actually held a markup on the bill.

I urge Members to vote ''no,'' to protect low-income Americans' Lifeline wireless phone service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, again, want to reiterate that this bill does not eliminate the Lifeline program. It takes it back to the original intent.

I appreciate the newfound commitment to deal with the waste, fraud, and abuse, and I look forward to working with you on that legislation, if this one should not pass. We have a responsibility to make sure that, when we are creating access to any program, we have integrity in this program. This is not in any way, shape, or form intended to do anything but to bring that integrity back.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is about eliminating approximately $500 million a year worth of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition of H.R. 5525, the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016, because it will end an essential program that helps millions of elderly, low-income and poor people have access to cellphone service.

As the founder and chair of the Children's Caucus I am particularly focused on the needs of children and their families.

H.R. 5525 would deny the Universal Service Fund, the charge levied on land lines to help fund telecommunications services for low income people, the ability to use funds to help people purchase cell phones.

The Lifeline Program was first implemented in 1985 by President Reagan and expanded in 2005 by President George W. Bush to include commercial mobile service and commercial data service, the Lifeline program ensures that all Americans have the opportunities, assistance, and security that phone service brings.

Lifeline is a successful program, currently supporting over 12 million people who make up our nation's most vulnerable populations to call 911 and other emergency services, contact prospective and current employers, and connect with essential health, social, employment, and educational services.

According to one Lifeline provider, more than 80 percent of Lifeline subscribers in 2011 had an average household income below $15,000; more than 45 percent of Lifeline subscribers were Caucasian compared to 40 percent who were African American and 7 percent who were Hispanic.

In the 2016 Lifeline Modernization Order, the Commission included broadband as a support service in the Lifeline program.

The Commission also set out minimum service standards for Lifeline-supported services to ensure maximum value for the universal service dollar, and established a National Eligibility Verifier to make independent subscriber eligibility determinations.

Lifeline enables the most vulnerable among us to be participating members of our society; cutting wireless services could prevent individuals from being able to, among other things:

receive a communication about a child's illness at school while they are at work;

summon medical help in a car accident;

speak with their employers about additional work shifts while commuting by public transit; or

alert first-responders of public emergencies (such as a fast-moving fire, a flooded road, or a violent attack) that pose a threat to the larger community.

Today, 9.8 million Americans depend on the Lifeline program to stay connected using mobile phones.

The legislation comes on the heels of real enforcement by the FCC to crack down on carriers that have abused the program, including a $51 million fine against Total Call Mobile announced in April.

Even more, this shameful bill was not considered under regular order and has not been considered by any committee.

If the critics of the Lifeline program sincerely think the costs of the program are a problem, they should work with Democrats to address inequality, to close the gender pay gap, to raise the minimum wage, and to put more people to work through universal broadband infrastructure projects.

The Lifeline Program is working in my state of Texas.

Texans are eligible for lifeline cell phone service if they receive benefits from any of the following programs:

National School Lunch (free program only);

Federal Public Housing Assistance / Section 8;

Health Benefit Coverage under Children's Health Insurance Plan (CHIP);

Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP)

Medicaid;

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Food Stamps);

Supplemental Security Income (SSI);

Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance;

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;

Tribally-Administered Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;

Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations;

You may also qualify for lifeline service in Texas if your Total Household Income is at or under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.

For these reasons I join the NAACP in strongly opposing H.R. 5525, because it will do real damage to our national effort to expand indispensable access to telephone and cellphone service.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 5525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5525.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORIZING USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4369) to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4369

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On December 22, 2015, the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners, the Los Angeles World Airports, the Ontario City Council, and the Ontario International Airport Authority agreed to transfer ownership and control of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports to the Ontario International Airport Authority, a local joint powers authority established by and between the county of San Bernardino and the city of Ontario.

(2) Pursuant to the agreement, the Ontario International Airport Authority intends to use between $70,000,000 and $120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected at Ontario International Airport to finance eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport, as compensation for passenger facility charges collected, consistent with section 40117(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, at Los Angeles International Airport for use at Ontario International Airport in the 1990s, when both airports were controlled by Los Angeles World Airports.

(3) The amendment made by subsection (b) applies exclusively to Ontario International Airport, allowing passenger facility charges to be used for eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport while making no other changes to passenger facility charges eligibility requirements.

(4) No additional appropriations are required to implement the agreement described in paragraph (1) or the amendment made by subsection (b).

(b) PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES.—Section 40117(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) USE OF PFC REVENUES AT PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (1) and subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may authorize use of a passenger facility charge to finance an eligible airport-related project if—

''(i) the eligible agency seeking to impose the new charge controls an airport where a $2 passenger facility charge became effective on January 1, 2013; and

''(ii) the airport described in clause (i) and the airport at which the project will be carried out were under the control of the same eligible agency on October 1, 2015.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than $120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected under subparagraph (A) may be used to carry out an eligible airport-related project described in that subparagraph.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4369.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4369, a bill that will provide regulatory relief to Los Angeles International Airport and Ontario International Airport and facilitate a transfer of Ontario International Airport to a new airport authority.

I want to thank Mr. CALVERT, the sponsor of the bill, for introducing this legislation and for his leadership on this issue.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4369.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4369, as you heard, is a bipartisan, narrowly tailored bill to address a time-sensitive issue in southern California that impacts the Ontario and Los Angeles International Airports, both of which serve my district in southern Nevada.

This bill has the support of my colleagues from southern California, and I appreciate them coming to the floor today to speak about its importance to their districts.

Mr. Speaker, when one airport authority takes ownership of an airport from another authority, there needs to be a process by which that new authority can repay the passenger facility charges that were collected up to that point. This bill would provide such a mechanism.

There is urgency in addressing this issue, as the current transfer authority between these two airports is set to expire at the end of this year. I support that, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the fact that, while we stand on the floor today discussing this urgent matter affecting our aviation system, we are mere weeks away from

the expiration of the third extension of the current FAA authorization bill.

Months ago, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee passed legislation which includes numerous time-sensitive and important provisions. Yet, because of a proposal to privatize our air traffic control system, I, along with my fellow Democrats on the committee, were forced to oppose the bill. Meanwhile, our Senate colleagues have passed a bipartisan FAA bill with overwhelming support.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am in favor of this legislation that we are considering today, but it is my sincere hope that we will see a similar urgency in addressing other aviation needs, like the needs of large airports like McCarran International Airport, in my district; the need to extend the authorization for the unmanned aerial test ranges; the need to develop a low-altitude air traffic management system for UAS operations; and the need to address a number of the important issues that are facing our Nation's airspace that are in the FAA reauthorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, today is a good day for the Inland Empire region in southern California. For many years now, our region has advocated for restoring local control of Ontario International Airport and putting the future growth of air travel in our own hands.

My legislation that the House is considering today, H.R. 4369, is one of the final necessary steps that will facilitate the transfer of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles to the Ontario International Airport Authority.

Both the cities of Ontario and Los Angeles, as well as FAA staff, have put in hundreds of hours of effort to approve and prepare for the management transfer of this hub airport.

When both Ontario International Airport and Los Angeles International Airport were operated by the same agencies, passenger facility charges, or PFCs, collected at one airport could be used for the projects at the other one.

□ 1445

Going forward, H.R. 4369 will enable a certain amount of passenger facility charges collected at the now independent Ontario International Airport to be used for projects at Los Angeles International Airport as a way to pay back LAX for sharing its passenger facility charges in the past years. Since it is not possible under existing law today, we are fixing this glitch.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support and will not cost the taxpayers a penny. Furthermore, the bill does nothing to increase passenger facility charges or any other fees for airport passengers.

H.R. 4369 is supported by all stakeholders, including the FAA, the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports, the City of Ontario, and the Ontario International Airport Authority. The bill is supported by the entire bipartisan Inland Empire delegation, including Representative TORRES, Representative AGUILAR, Representative COOK, Representative ROYCE, Representative RUIZ, and Representative TAKANO.

Over in the Senate, Senator FEINSTEIN has introduced identical legislation, and I am hopeful the Senate can quickly approve this bill after we pass it here today.

There have been many people involved in this effort over the past few years. I want to specifically thank FAA Administrator Michael Huerta, Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti, Ontario Councilmen Alan Wapner and Jim Bowman, as well as the rest of the Ontario City Council and other elected officials from throughout the Inland Empire who have supported restoring local control of Ontario Airport.

I also want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY and Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER for helping us move this important legislation to the House floor today.

The Inland Empire has and continues to be one of the fastest growing regions in California and in the Nation, and it is far past time that we control our own aviation future. I am confident, with local control restored, Ontario International Airport will be a significant contributor to future economic growth in our region.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who is a cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today is a key step to finalizing the transfer of local control of the Ontario International Airport, a transfer which, after lengthy negotiations, was finally agreed to by all parties last year.

This transfer, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. Ontario Airport, located in my congressional district, is a major economic driver for the Inland Empire region.

When Los Angeles World Airports began operating Ontario back in 1967, it was with the intention of attracting more airlines and service options to the Inland Empire. Well, circumstances have changed quite a bit since that time.

The Inland Empire isn't just the outskirts of Los Angeles anymore. It is a rapidly growing region, attracting more and more new residents and businesses with a strategic location along a major freight corridor that makes it a hub for manufactured and agricultural goods.

It also provides more convenient air travel options to residents of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties who, otherwise, would have to travel up to 2 or 3 hours to fly out of LAX.

Transferring control of the airport back to Ontario means that the people who are most affected and who most closely understand the needs of the region are the ones who are going to be shaping the airport's future. This transfer is not possible without the legislation we are considering today.

As part of the settlement agreement, $120 million of passenger facility revenue collected at Ontario will be used for FAA-qualified capital projects at LAX. $50 million of that will come from existing passenger facilities fees that are controlled by LAWA, but were collected at Ontario. The remaining $70 million will come from future passenger facility charges collected at Ontario within the next 10 years. These are funds that have always been intended to go to LAWA for projects at LAX.

Congress must now pass this one-time fix that will allow the transfer of funds from one airport authority to another. Otherwise, once control of Ontario Airport shifts to the Ontario International Airport Authority, there will be no mechanism to transfer the funds to LAWA as they have agreed. Without this bill, the agreement cannot move forward, and the FAA cannot approve the agreement and grant the Ontario International Airport Authority a certificate to operate.

Many of us have been calling for local control of Ontario Airport for quite a long time, and this agreement has been years in the making. All parties have agreed to the terms and are ready to move forward. As a frequent flier out of Ontario, I hope Congress does not stand in its way.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman CALVERT, for helping to bring this important bill to the floor, and the rest of the Inland Empire delegation for their support.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), another cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Inland Empire should have control of its regional airport, and local residents should have access to affordable domestic and international flights.

With that in mind, I rise in support of H.R. 4369, which would facilitate the transfer of Ontario International Airport from the City of Los Angeles.

While the number of flights offered at Ontario Airport has decreased, the demand for those flights has not. Industry experts estimate that 2 million passengers a year are forced to drive to Los Angeles or other regional airports due to the lack of flights and connections offered at Ontario. The region is

losing up to 8,000 jobs and $400 million in yearly business activity.

As the Inland Empire continues to grow in population, it needs the Ontario International Airport to be under local control. It is a vital economic resource to our region, with the potential to serve 30 million passengers annually, and it is a conflict of interest for Los Angeles World Airports to control Ontario, a direct competitor.

On a personal note, I am ready to give up the long commute from Riverside to LAX. And in that spirit, 3 years ago I wrote a letter to Mayor Garcetti of Los Angeles outlining the need to transfer control of Ontario Airport to our region. I am happy that we are finally moving forward with this legislation to ensure an arrangement that is best for the Inland Empire.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman KEN CALVERT and Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, and all the rest of our delegation from the Inland Empire of southern California, for their hard work on this issue. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. I also extend my thanks to the gentlewoman from Nevada for her support.

I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no further speakers. I just want to say that I support this legislation. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I also admonish them to show the same degree of urgency when it comes to reauthorizing the FAA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill of my colleague, Mr. CALVERT.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R 4369, ''A bill that authorizes the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.''

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I strongly support this commonsense measure to improve and sustain airport security.

Since its inception, Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) have been used to improve safety, enhance security, and increase the capacity of airports to serve the traveling public.

A Passenger Facility Charge is a service fee and is also an additional fee charged to departing and connecting passengers at an airport.

H.R. 4369 clarifies and streamlines opportunities that will help ease travel through our nation's airports while improving our national security.

For example this bill will enable:

The preservation and protection of the nation's air transportation system;

Enhanced competition between and among air carriers;

Funding projects that benefit local communities; and

Meeting airline and passenger demands to accommodate future growth for our nation's economy.

In 2015, more than 700 million passengers and 400 million checked bags were screened by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

Each day, TSA processes an average of 1.7 million passengers at more than 450 airports across the nation.

In 2012, TSA screened 637,582,122 passengers.

The Bush International and the William P. Hobby Airports are essential hubs for domestic and international air travel for Houston and the region.

Nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush International Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU).

More than 650 daily departures occur at IAH.

IAH is the 11th busiest airport in the U.S. for total passenger traffic.

IAH has 12 all-cargo airlines and handled more than 419,205 metric tons of cargo in 2012.

Airlines and airports are expected to experience a significant increase in passenger traffic coming into the 2016 summer peak travel months across the nation's largest airports.

As a result of the Passenger Facility Charges airports will continue to receive the needed funds to modernize and keep up with the growing traffic demands and safety and security challenges of our nation's airports.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4369, which would allow for a local settlement agreement in Southern California between the City of Los Angeles and the new Ontario Airport Authority.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for bringing this bill to the House floor today, and I thank Congresswoman TITUS for managing the floor debate.

I would also like to thank my bipartisan colleagues from California, Rep. CALVERT and Rep. TORRES, for their leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, after 5 years of negotiations the City of Los Angeles has agreed to transfer its ownership of the Ontario Airport to a new airport authority created by the City of Ontario and San Bernardino County.

This deal has been supported by all stakeholders in order to give the people of the Inland Empire in Southern California control over their own airport.

The residents, businesses, and cities in my district in the San Gabriel Valley are also very supportive of this agreement. The Ontario Airport is only 15 miles from the center of my district, whereas Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is 40 miles from the center of my district, and there is constant traffic. San Gabriel Valley residents and businesses would much rather use Ontario Airport than LAX if it had better flight options to more locations, which this bill will help accomplish. Allowing for local control of the airport puts the best interest of our region first in improving and managing the airport. I am also appreciative that this agreement makes sure that airport workers will not lose their jobs during and after the transition.

The major point in this local agreement was providing for the repayment of passenger facility charge fees (PFCs) that Los Angeles had collected at LAX in the 1990s and used to construct a new terminal at Ontario Airport.

The settlement agreement requires Ontario Airport to pay back LAX with future PFCs collected at Ontario. The problem is that federal law only allows the transfer of PFCs from one airport to another airport if they are owned by the same airport authority. This is the current law that allowed LAX to transfer PFCs to Ontario.

Since the new agreement transfers control of Ontario Airport to a new airport authority, without our legislation the new Ontario Airport authority is prohibited from paying back the PFCs to LAX.

Mr. Speaker, our bill today is a narrow change in the use of PFCs to allow those collected at Ontario International Airport to be used for projects at LAX. This amendment was carefully written as to only apply to Ontario Airport and LAX. There are no federal funds used in this amendment, and it does not change any of the policy requirements of the use of PFCs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of my colleagues for H.R. 4369.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4369.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR RAPID INNOVATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5388) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5388

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 319. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support the research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of cybersecurity technologies, including fundamental research to improve the sharing of information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with current law.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—The research and development supported under subsection (a) shall serve the components of the Department and shall—

''(1) advance the development and accelerate the deployment of more secure information systems;

''(2) improve and create technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions, including real-time continuous diagnostics and real-time analytic technologies;

''(3) improve and create mitigation and recovery methodologies, including techniques and policies for real-time containment of attacks, and development of resilient networks and information systems;

''(4) support, in coordination with non-Federal entities, the review of source code that underpins critical infrastructure information systems;

''(5) develop and support infrastructure and tools to support cybersecurity research and development efforts, including modeling, testbeds, and data sets for assessment of new cybersecurity technologies;

''(6) assist the development and support of technologies to reduce vulnerabilities in industrial control systems; and

''(7) develop and support cyber forensics and attack attribution capabilities.

''(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall coordinate activities with—

''(1) the Under Secretary appointed pursuant to section 103(a)(1)(H);

''(2) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate; and

''(3) industry and academia.

''(d) TRANSITION TO PRACTICE.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support projects carried out under this title through the full life cycle of such projects, including research, development, testing, evaluation, pilots, and transitions. The Under Secretary shall identify mature technologies that address existing or imminent cybersecurity gaps in public or private information systems and networks of information systems, identify and support necessary improvements identified during pilot programs and testing and evaluation activities, and introduce new cybersecurity technologies throughout the homeland security enterprise through partnerships and commercialization. The Under Secretary shall target federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within two years and that is expected to have a notable impact on the public or private information systems and networks of information systems.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term 'cybersecurity risk' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

''(2) HOMELAND SECURITY ENTERPRISE.—The term 'homeland security enterprise' means relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities involved in homeland security, including Federal, State, local, and tribal government officials, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

''(3) INCIDENT.—The term 'incident' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

''(4) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term 'information system' has the meaning given such term in section 3502(8) of title 44, United States Code.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 318 the following new item:

''Sec. 319. Cybersecurity research and development.''.

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2020'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking the last sentence; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PRIOR APPROVAL.—In any case in which the head of a component or office of the Department seeks to utilize the authority under this section, such head shall first receive prior approval from the Secretary by providing to the Secretary a proposal that includes the rationale for the utilization of such authority, the funds to be spent on the use of such authority, and the expected outcome for each project that is the subject of the use of such authority. In such a case, the authority for evaluating the proposal may not be delegated by the Secretary to anyone other than the Under Secretary for Management.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2020''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report detailing the projects for which the authority granted by subsection (a) was utilized, the rationale for such utilizations, the funds spent utilizing such authority, the extent of cost-sharing for such projects among Federal and non-Federal sources, the extent to which utilization of such authority has addressed a homeland security capability gap or threat to the homeland identified by the Department, the total amount of payments, if any, that were received by the Federal Government as a result of the utilization of such authority during the period covered by each such report, the outcome of each project for which such authority was utilized, and the results of any audits of such projects.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall develop a training program for acquisitions staff on the utilization of the authority provided under subsection (a).''.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as part of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY's Innovation Initiative, I am very pleased to bring two important bills to the floor today that further the leader's efforts for ensuring that government can more effectively leverage cutting-edge cyber technologies.

As chairman of the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, my colleagues and I have been working diligently with technology innovators, including tech startups, to find solutions that will help spur innovation and break down bureaucratic barriers that are currently preventing government from leveraging the private sector's emerging technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the House is first considering H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016, on the floor today. H.R. 5388 requires the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate, or S&T, to more effectively coordinate with industry and academia to support the research and development of cybersecurity technologies.

H.R. 5388 requires S&T to support the full lifecycle of cyber research and development projects and to identify mature technologies to address cybersecurity gaps. In doing so, S&T must target federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within 2 years.

This bill also extends the use of other transaction authority, or OTA, until the year 2020, which will improve DHS' ability to engage tech startups that are developing these cutting-edge technologies.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5388 also includes important accountability requirements to ensure that there will be proper oversight of the authority.

In December of last year, the House passed H.R. 3578, the Science and Technology Reform and Improvement Act. That bill included provisions similar to those in the bill that we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, we have seen evolving cybersecurity threats from nation-states, including China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran, as well as cyber threats from criminal organizations and terrorist groups like ISIS. Cyber criminals continue to develop even more cutting-edge cyber capabilities.

In 2016, these hackers pose an even greater threat to the U.S. homeland and our critical infrastructure. The Federal Government desperately needs to keep pace with these evolving threats and more actively work with the private sector to find solutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security's Directorate of Science and Technology is the primary research and development arm of the Department and, because the Directorate manages basic and applied research and development, including cybersecurity R&D for the Department's operational components and first responders, ensuring that there are

mechanisms in place like S&T's cybersecurity research and development programs and OTA to support the dynamic nature of the cybersecurity research and development is both vital and essential for addressing Homeland Security capability gaps.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for calling up this important bill today because I am convinced that it will have an incredibly positive impact on encouraging technology innovation across the Nation to address our evolving homeland security needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 5388, the ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016,'' which your Committee reported on June 8, 2016.

H.R. 5388 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5388, the ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

□ 1500

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016, directs the Department of Homeland Security to support advancements in cybersecurity research. Hackers, cyberterrorists, and other cybercriminals are constantly innovating. As such, it is a security imperative that the Federal Government—or, more specifically, DHS—innovate, too. To that end, H.R. 5388 directs DHS to support promising projects to, among other things, improve the detection of cyber attacks or intrusions and mitigation and recovery from such attacks.

This bill is based on two provisions contained in H.R. 3578, the DHS Science and Technology Reform and Improvement Act, which passed the House last December. Specifically, H.R. 5388 directs DHS' Under Secretary for Science and Technology to bolster research and development of cybersecurity technology to improve the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies to address cybersecurity risk and incidents. Additionally, H.R. 5388 extends for 4 years the Department's authority to utilize other transaction authority instead of the Federal Acquisition Regulation to fund basic, applied, and advanced R&D projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) has put two bills before this House, two bills that are part of our broader Innovation Initiative that take the power of human discovery and apply it to national security.

We know that what protected us in the past isn't sufficient for today or the future. Oceans were our greatest defense for much of our history, but distance became less important in the age of jets and rockets. Radar was a revolutionary discovery that helped us see threats before they arrived, but radar can't help us find a potential terrorist being radicalized in our very own neighborhoods.

We can't rely today on what worked in the past. We need new weapons, new tools, and new defenses. We need more, and the government can't do it alone. The dangers are too pressing for Washington to find the best ways to protect the American people all by itself.

Across this country, there are innovators who are finding the answers, and we need to listen to them. The House knows this, and one of our bills directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with private citizens who can join in the task of making our great country safe.

The second bill of the Innovation Initiative today focuses explicitly on cybersecurity: to update and improve detection of intrusions, improve recovery, and reduce vulnerabilities in the industrial systems we rely on.

We have seen, repeatedly, from the Office of Personnel Management to the IRS to businesses in the private sector that our cyber defenses are simply not up to the task. But we can do better. We always can and we always will.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the ideas being put forward for the Innovation Initiative so far. America has unprecedented potential, and through the focus of this initiative, we will discover new and better ways to keep America safe.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces growing, diverse, and increasingly sophisticated cybersecurity threats. These threats necessitate a Federal response that includes supporting innovative cybersecurity research and development, testing, and evaluation. This response is dependent on strong public and private collaboration. Such collaboration is essential to ensuring that promising technologies are introduced into the marketplace in a timely manner.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5388.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5388, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5388, the "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016," which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for improved innovative research and development.

I support this bill because it would extend the Department of Homeland Security secretary's pilot program for research and development projects and prototype projects through 2020.

This bill would require the secretary to report annually to the House Homeland Security and Science committees and the Senate Homeland Security Committee on the dynamics of the projects undertaken.

Specifically, H.R. 5388 would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to include fundamental improvements to facilitate information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with the current law.

In particular, it adds a new section to the Homeland Security Act, directing the Department of Homeland Security to support—whether within itself, other agencies, or in academia and private industry—the research and development of cybersecurity-related technologies.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee and Subcommittee on Crime Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I support this bill as it directs the Under Secretary for Science and Technology to bolster research and development, along

with the testing and evaluation of cybersecurity technology to improve the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

The Rapid Innovation Act is a smart bill that will enable the Department of Homeland Security to establish and improve technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions.

The ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016'' will equip the Department of Homeland Security with vital tools and resources to prevent and remove attacks and threats implemented by those who target our nation.

Mr. Speaker, we face growing cybersecurity threats, which demands that we increase research and development, along with the testing and evaluation of cybersecurity technology to expand the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

This is a comprehensive bill that will help protect all Americans in every corner of this nation.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 5388.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5388.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LEVERAGING EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5389) to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5389

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. INNOVATION ENGAGEMENT.

(a) INNOVATION ENGAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security—

(A) shall engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures, to address homeland security needs; and

(B) may identify geographic areas in the United States with high concentrations of such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, and may establish personnel and office space in such areas, as appropriate.

(2) ENGAGEMENT.—Engagement under paragraph (1) may include innovative and emerging technology developers or firms with proven technologies, supported with outside investment, with potential applications for the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) CO-LOCATION.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that it is appropriate to establish personnel and office space in a specific geographic area in the United States pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall co-locate such personnel and office space with other existing assets of—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security, where possible; or

(B) Federal facilities, where appropriate.

(4) OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 30 days after establishing personnel and office space in a specific geographic area in the United States pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall inform Congress about the rationale for such establishment, the anticipated costs associated with such establishment, and the specific goals for such establishment.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop, implement, and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a Department of Homeland Security-wide strategy to proactively engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures, in accordance with subsection (a). Such strategy shall—

(1) focus on sustainable methods and guidance to build relationships, including with such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms in geographic areas in the United States with high concentrations of such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, and in geographic areas outside such areas, to establish, develop, and enhance departmental capabilities to address homeland security needs;

(2) include efforts to—

(A) ensure proven innovative and emerging technologies can be included in existing and future acquisition contracts;

(B) coordinate with organizations that provide venture capital to businesses, particularly small businesses and startup ventures, as appropriate, to assist the commercialization of innovative and emerging technologies that are expected to be ready for commercialization in the near term and within 36 months; and

(C) address barriers to the utilization of innovative and emerging technologies and the engagement of small businesses and startup ventures in the acquisition process;

(3) include a description of how the Department plans to leverage proven innovative and emerging technologies to address homeland security needs; and

(4) include the criteria the Secretary plans to use to determine an innovative or technology is proven.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support and I am very pleased that the House is considering H.R. 5389, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016. H.R. 5389 encourages engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, including tech startups.

This important bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to proactively engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms to address homeland security needs. More specifically, H.R. 5389 provides the Secretary authority to identify geographic areas in the United States where high concentrations of innovative and emerging technology developers and firms exist and to establish personnel and office space in these areas to more effectively collaborate with these technology hubs.

The Federal Government needs to do a better job working with the private sector, and this bill will support that goal by requiring the Secretary to develop and implement a targeted strategy to proactively engage innovative and emerging technology developers and firms. The Secretary must use this strategic plan to address and to reduce barriers to leveraging innovative and emerging technologies and the small business and startup ventures that create those technologies by incorporating them into the Department's acquisition process.

In order to keep pace, the Department of Homeland Security recently established an office in Silicon Valley to encourage engagement and communication with the innovative technology developers in that area. Although a vital technology hub, Silicon Valley is not the only technology hub in the United States. For that reason, the Department should not be limited to a single geographic area from which to identify emerging and innovative technologies.

Mr. Speaker, we are all learning that cybersecurity is national security. The Nation is under constant cyber attack from nation-states, from criminal groups, and from terrorist organizations, and, with each passing day, the attacks and tools that they are using are becoming more sophisticated. Requiring the Department to consider strategically how it will engage these technology developers will strengthen the Department's ability to access innovative and emerging technologies in order to combat these evolving threats.

I am happy to support this measure today and believe it will move us toward further addressing homeland security needs by supporting technology innovation.

Before I close, I include in the RECORD an exchange between the chairman of the Committee on Science,

Space, and Technology and the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 5389, the ''Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016,'' which your Committee reported on June 8, 2016.

H.R. 5389 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your interest in H.R. 5389, the ''Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016.'' I appreciate your cooperation in allowing this legislation to move expeditiously before the House of Representatives on June 21, 2016. I understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, to the extent it may have a jurisdictional claim, will not seek a sequential referral on the bill; and therefore, there has been no formal determination as to its jurisdiction by the Parliamentarian. While we are not prepared to recognize the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology over this bill, we do appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that the absence of a decision on this bill at this time does not prejudice any claim the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology may have held or may have on similar legislation in the future.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5389, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 5389, a bipartisan bill that directs the Department of Homeland Security to engage, in an unprecedented fashion, with developers of innovative and emerging technologies.

When it comes to tackling vexing homeland security challenges, Washington does not have the monopoly on groundbreaking, forward-thinking ideas. H.R. 5389 specifically directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with innovative and emerging technology developers to help tackle the rapidly expanding list of homeland security technology needs.

To encourage such engagement, the bill authorizes DHS to establish personnel and office space in diverse geographical areas around the United States that have high concentrations of technology developers and firms to nurture relationships.

In April 2015, the Department announced that it was establishing a Silicon Valley office to cultivate relationships with technology innovators, particularly nontraditional performers, such as small startups, investors, incubators, and accelerators. The establishment of this office is in furtherance of DHS' homeland security innovation program, whose goal is to generate innovation in hubs around the Nation and the world to solve DHS' most difficult technology challenges.

Over the past year, through these programs, DHS has reached out to technology innovators and other stakeholders at regional events held in Boston, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, Louisville, and Austin.

To ensure that DHS pursues outreach to innovators and related stakeholders in a thoughtful manner, H.R. 5389 also directs DHS, within 6 months, to develop and submit to Congress a Department-wide strategy for such engagement. Importantly, the bill specifically calls for DHS to include ways to effectively engage with technology-based small businesses and startup ventures in the strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. H.R. 5389 was unanimously approved by the Committee on Homeland Security on June 8. It recognizes that DHS depends on technology to carry out its missions and for the Department to effectively identify, support, and procure innovative technology. DHS must nurture and maintain robust and direct relationships with technology developers.

Two features of the strategy required under this act that I would like to highlight are that it directs DHS to give attention to fostering engagement with developers that may be located outside a recognized regional technology hub, and coordinate with venture capital organizations to help emerging technology developers, including small businesses and startup ventures, commercialize technologies that address a rapidly growing list of homeland security needs.

I also join my colleague from Texas in supporting this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 5389.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for cosponsoring this bill and for his leadership in this area.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5389.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 5389, the "Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016," which requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with innovative and emerging technology developers, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures that can help tackle the rapidly expanding list of homeland security technology needs.

H.R. 5389 helps to protect America's computer and communications networks, which security experts believe represent the nation's most critical national security challenge, including internet functions and connected critical infrastructure such as air traffic control, the U.S. electrical grid, and nuclear power plants.

H.R. 5389 authorizes DHS to establish personnel and office space in diverse geographic areas around the United States that have high concentrations of technology developers and firms.

The bill also directs DHS, within 6 months, to develop and submit to Congress a Department-wide strategy to engage with innovative and emerging technology companies.

Importantly, the bill specifically requires the Secretary to include in that strategy ways to effectively integrate technology-based small businesses and startup ventures.

Importantly, the bill also requires the DHS Secretary to coordinate with those in the venture capital industry to assist in the development of technologies that are ready for commercialization and use in the Homeland Security Enterprise.

Since its founding, the Department of Homeland Security has overcome many challenges as an organization but much more progress must be made regarding effective inter-operable communication between the federal, state, and local agencies.

Although not a panacea, H.R. 5389 is a step in the right direction because it will help improve DHS' overall functions so that it can more effectively protect our people.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5389.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATING RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS ACT

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4639) to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4639

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) $24,119,000 for fiscal year 2016 and $25,735,000 for each of fiscal years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 to carry out subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this Act).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be deemed to apply beginning on October 1, 2015.

SEC. 3. ACCESS TO AGENCY INFORMATION.

Section 1212(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) In carrying out this subchapter, the Special Counsel is authorized to—

''(i) have access to any record or other information (including a report, audit, review, document, recommendation, or other material) of any agency under the jurisdiction of the Office of Special Counsel, consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (C); and

''(ii) require any employee of such an agency to provide to the Office any record or other information during an investigation, review, or inquiry of any agency under the jurisdiction of the Office.

''(B) With respect to any record or other information made available by an agency under this subchapter, the Office shall apply a level of confidentiality to such record or information at the level of confidentiality applied to the record by the agency.

''(C) With respect to any record or other information described under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or an Inspector General may withhold access to any such record or other information if the disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, but only if the Attorney General or applicable agency head submits a written report to the Office of Special Counsel describing the record or other information withheld and the reason for the withholding.''.

SEC. 4. WHISTLEBLOWER PROVISIONS.

Section 1213 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''15 days'' and inserting ''45 days'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking ''such as'' and inserting ''including''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) if any disclosure referred to an agency head under subsection (c) is substantiated in whole or in part by the agency head, a detailed explanation of the failure to take any action described under paragraph (5).''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) If an agency head submits a report to the Special Counsel under subsection (d) that includes a description of any agency action proposed to be taken as a result of the investigation, the agency head shall, not later than 180 days after the date of such submission, submit a supplemental report to the Special Counsel stating whether any proposed action has been taken, and if the action has not been taken, the reason why it has not been taken.''.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF CERTAIN OSC INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1214(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) Within 30 days of receiving an allegation from a person under paragraph (1), the Special Counsel may terminate an investigation under such paragraph with respect to the allegation, without further inquiry or an opportunity for the person to respond, if the Special Counsel determines that—

''(i) the same allegation, based on the same set of facts and circumstances—

''(I) had previously been made by the person and previously investigated by the Special Counsel; or

''(II) had previously been filed by the person with the Merit Systems Protection Board;

''(ii) the Office of Special Counsel does not have jurisdiction to investigate the allegation; or

''(iii) the person knew or should have known of the alleged prohibited personnel practice earlier than the date that is 3 years before the date Special Counsel received the allegation.

''(B) If the Special Counsel terminates an investigation under subparagraph (A), not later than 30 days after the date of such termination the Special Counsel shall provide a written notification stating the basis for the termination to the person who made the allegation. Paragraph (1)(D) shall not apply to any termination under such subparagraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''The Special Counsel'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (6), the Special Counsel''; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(C), in the matter before clause (i), by inserting ''or paragraph (6)'' after ''paragraph (2)''.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) OSC ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1218 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1218. Annual report

''(a) The Special Counsel shall submit an annual report to Congress on the activities of the Special Counsel. Any such report shall include—

''(1) the number, types, and disposition of allegations of prohibited personnel practices filed with the Special Counsel, and the cost of allegations so disposed of;

''(2) the number of investigations conducted by the Special Counsel;

''(3) the number of stays or disciplinary actions negotiated by the Special Counsel with agencies;

''(4) the number of cases in which the Special Counsel did not make a determination whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that a prohibited personnel practice has occurred, exists, or is to be taken within the 240-day period specified in section 1214(b)(2)(A)(i);

''(5) a description of the recommendations and reports made by the Special Counsel to other agencies pursuant to this subchapter, and the actions taken by the agencies as a result of the reports or recommendations;

''(6) the number of—

''(A) actions initiated before the Merit Systems Protection Board, including the number of corrective action petitions and disciplinary action complaints so initiated; and

''(B) stays and stay extensions obtained from the Board; and

''(7) the number of prohibited personnel practice complaints that result in—

''(A) a favorable action for the complainant, categorized by actions with respect to whistleblower reprisal cases and all other cases; and

''(B) a favorable outcome for the complainant, categorized by outcomes with respect to whistleblower reprisal cases and all other cases.

''(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include whatever recommendations for legislation or other action by Congress the Special Counsel may consider appropriate.''.

(b) OSC PUBLIC INFORMATION.—Section 1219(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) a list of any noncriminal matter referred to an agency head under section 1213(c), together with—

''(A) the applicable transmittal of the matter to the agency head under section 1213(c)(1);

''(B) any report from agency head under section 1213(c)(1)(B) relating to such matter;

''(C) if appropriate, not otherwise prohibited by law, and with the consent of the complainant, any comments from the complainant under section 1213(e)(1) relating to the matter; and

''(D) the Special Counsel's comments or recommendations under section 1213(e)(3) or (4) relating to the matter;''.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURVEY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Special Counsel shall design and establish a survey pilot program under which the Office shall conduct, with respect to fiscal years 2017 and 2018, a survey of individuals who have filed a complaint or disclosure with the Office. The survey shall be designed to gather responses from the individuals for the purpose of collecting information and improving customer service at various stages of the review or investigative process. The results of the survey shall be published in the annual report of the Office.

(b) SUSPENSION OF OTHER SURVEYS.—During fiscal years 2017 and 2018, section 13 of Public Law 103–424 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 8. PENALTIES UNDER THE HATCH ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7326 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 7326. Penalties

''An employee or individual who violates section 7323 or 7324 shall be subject to—

''(1) disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand;

''(2) an assessment of a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000; or

''(3) any combination of the penalties described in paragraph (1) or (2).''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any violation of section 7323 or 7324 of title 5, United States

Code, occurring after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Special Counsel shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to perform the functions of the Special Counsel under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code, including regulations necessary to carry out sections 1213, 1214, and 1215 of such title, and any functions required due to the amendments made by this Act. Such regulations shall be published in the Federal Register.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4639, the Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act.

This is a bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, or OSC, over the next 5 years. The bipartisan legislation was passed unanimously out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. It also has the support of the whistleblower community.

Mr. Speaker, OSC is tasked with a variety of responsibilities, including policing whistleblower retaliation across the entire executive branch, an immense responsibility.

OSC's last reauthorization expired in 2007, so this bill is long overdue.

In addition to reauthorizing the agency, this bill aims to give OSC the tools it needs to continue the good work it is already doing. For example, this legislation would ensure that OSC has the access to agency records that it needs. Agencies should not be able to stonewall OSC to stop the Special Counsel from investigating retaliation within their agency.

Like inspectors general, OSC must have access to agency information in order to properly conduct the duties they are charged with by Congress. OSC is part of the executive branch, just the same as the agencies that Special Counsel oversees, so those agencies should not be able to invoke legal privileges to withhold information. Take the attorney-client privilege as an example. These agencies all represent the same client—the Federal Government—which works for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also allows OSC to use a simplified process to close out duplicate complaints so it can focus its resources on new whistleblower allegations. It puts a statute of limitations on whistleblower retaliation cases of 3 years, after which documents and witness recollections can be hard to obtain. These steps will help to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of OSC operations.

Mr. Speaker, OSC has an immensely important role to play in protecting whistleblowers, helping to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. I believe this bill will be good for the agency and good for the whistleblowers that they are charged to protect.

I urge that we pass it here in the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4639, a bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel.

I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Representatives CONNOLLY, BLUM, and MEADOWS for their leadership in crafting this bipartisan bill.

While the Office of Special Counsel plays a vital role in the Federal Government, the Office of Special Counsel, or OSC, protects Federal employees, especially whistleblowers, from prohibited personnel practices, such as discrimination, retaliation, and improper hiring practices.

OSC also serves as a safe place for Federal whistleblowers to disclose wrongdoings. The agency also safeguards the preference and employment rights of veterans, guardsmen, and reservists to ensure that they are not disadvantaged or discriminated against because of their service.

Reauthorization of OSC is long overdue. The last statutory authorization for the agency expired in fiscal year 2007. This bill will authorize nearly $26 million in annual funding for OSC for the fiscal years 2017 through 2020.

I commend current Special Counsel, Carolyn Lerner, for her leadership and work in making the OSC a more effective investigative body.

This bill would make changes that would help OSC conduct investigations and hold agencies accountable when wrongdoing is identified. For example, the bill would provide OSC with clear authority to obtain information from agencies during an investigation. Providing this authority to OSC would make clear that agencies must cooperate in the same way Congress expects agencies to cooperate with the inspectors general and GAO.

If disclosing certain information could interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, this measure would allow the attorney general or an inspector general to withhold access to such information.

This bill would also increase agency accountability when allegations of misconduct are substantiated. Agencies that fail to implement a recommendation made by OSC will be required to explain why they have failed to take such actions.

This legislation is critically important for ensuring that Federal employees have a venue for seeking redress against prohibited personnel practices.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel. I thank Representatives BLUM, CONNOLLY, and MEADOWS, as well as Chairman CHAFFETZ, for working with me in such a bipartisan way on this legislation.

As my colleagues know, one of my top priorities as Ranking Member of the Oversight Committee is the protection of federal employees from discrimination and retaliation.

The Office of Special Counsel plays an especially important role in ensuring that the work environment of federal employees is free of such prohibited personnel practices. OSC's last reauthorization ended in 2007. It is unacceptable that OSC still hasn't been authorized nearly ten years later.

This legislation would reauthorize OSC through 2020, and it would make changes to help OSC be more effective. For example, it would make clear that OSC is entitled to access agency information in its investigations.

This bill would also allow OSC to hold agencies more accountable for whistleblower retaliation. Under the bill, if an agency substantiates a whistleblower disclosure from OSC but fails to take a recommended corrective action, the agency must explain why it failed to take the action. This legislation would strengthen the tools available to OSC for addressing and correcting retaliation and discrimination in the federal workplace.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting passage of H.R. 4639.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4639, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY ELEANORA McCOY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5028) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E. Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building'', as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5028

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MARY E. MCCOY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721

E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the ''Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5028, introduced by my colleague on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representative BRENDA LAWRENCE of Michigan.

The bill designates a post office in Detroit, Michigan, as the Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building.

Born in an underground railroad station, Mrs. McCoy was a dedicated advocate for women's and civil rights in the 19th century.

I look forward to learning more about Mrs. McCoy from the sponsor of this bill and a fellow member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representative LAWRENCE.

I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor H.R. 5028, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 East Jefferson Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building.

It brings me great pride that my first bill considered before the House surrounds the United States Postal Service and Mary McCoy, an activist who was able to provide housing, education, health care, and economic support to women and children during the Jim Crow era. I spent almost 30 years in the Postal Service and saw firsthand the importance of these government agencies to communities throughout the country. They are central to every American city and provide a vital service to senior citizens on a daily basis.

Today I stand in recognition of Mary McCoy, a woman who organized and provided essential services to African Americans and other minorities who lacked access to adequate medical care, housing options, and education, all at a time when women lacked basic voting rights.

The daughter of two escaped slaves, Mary McCoy was born in an underground railroad station in 1846. Mary rose to become a philanthropist and leader of the African American and female populations in Michigan, bringing these diverse communities together in a time of great divide.

Through the establishment of organizations and group homes, Mary was able to provide support, safety, and community for women and children throughout Michigan.

The wife of the renowned innovator, Elijah McCoy, Mary forever changed the cultural landscape in the United States for African Americans and women, developing innovative methods to support both communities. Mary established scholarships for children of former slaves and gave shelter to orphans and senior citizens throughout Michigan.

Mary was able to provide these essential services by founding and supporting some of Michigan's most prominent women's clubs and organizations. These groups include, but are not limited to, the Michigan State Association of Colored Women, the McCoy Home for Colored Children, and the Phyllis Wheatley Home for Aged Colored Women.

Mary McCoy worked her entire life to alleviate the racism, sexism, and ageism that plagued our Nation. She lived to see a cultural shift in America that went far beyond the 15th and 19th amendments.

Dying at the age of 77 from injuries sustained in a car crash, Mary McCoy will always be remembered as a hero for her work in sheltering the homeless, healing the sick, and supporting many of Michigan's most charitable endeavors.

I urge the passage of H.R. 5028.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5028, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the 'Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building' ''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ED PASTOR POST OFFICE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4010) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4010

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ED PASTOR POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, shall be known and designated as the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4010, introduced by Representative RUBEN GALLEGO of Arizona. The bill designates a post office in Phoenix, Arizona, as the Ed Pastor Post Office. Former Representative Ed Pastor served in the House of Representatives for 24 years, from 1991 until last year.

I look forward to hearing more about Representative Pastor from the bill's sponsor and my distinguished colleague, Representative GALLEGO. For now, I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4010, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Phoenix, Arizona, as the Ed Pastor Post Office.

Ed Pastor dedicated his life to public service. After working for Arizona Governor Raul Castro and after having served three terms on the County Board of Supervisors, Ed Pastor was elected to this very Chamber in 1991. Congressman Pastor was a founding member of the Progressive Caucus, was chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in the 104th Congress, and served as the deputy whip of the Democratic Caucus. Congressman Pastor retired following his 12th term in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize the many years Ed Pastor

spent in advocating on behalf of his constituents and in working to improve the lives of all Americans. I urge the passage of H.R. 4010.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a bill that, in a small but significant way, honors the legacy of a Latino trailblazer and a great Arizonan, Congressman Ed Pastor.

Congressman Pastor dedicated his life to fighting for working families. Renaming a post office in the district he represented with distinction for 12 terms is the very least we can do to recognize his more than three decades of outstanding public service.

I thank my colleagues in the Arizona delegation for their enthusiastic support of this bill. I am also grateful to Chairman CHAFFETZ and to Ranking Member CUMMINGS for enabling this bill to come to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Ed Pastor's life embodies the American Dream. Throughout his time in Congress, Mr. Pastor fought to make the dream accessible to everyone, including to the most vulnerable in our society. As Leader PELOSI once wrote: Ed Pastor never forgot his roots and always worked to build a brighter future for the children of our Nation.

The son of a miner, Mr. Pastor was the first member of his family to go to college and receive his bachelor's degree from Arizona State University in 1966. After graduation, he taught at North High School in Phoenix before returning to ASU in 1971 to earn his law degree. Mr. Pastor subsequently worked on the staff of Arizona's first Latino Governor, Raul Castro—a job that cemented his lifelong commitment to public service. Mr. Pastor later served three terms on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors before being elected to the 102nd Congress in a special election in 1991. Congressman Pastor spent 24 years in this body and earned a reputation as a tireless advocate for the people of Arizona.

I am proud to say that Mr. Pastor was the first Latino to be elected to Congress from our great State. He was also one of the founding members of the Progressive Caucus and chaired the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in the 104th Congress. In addition, he served on the House Appropriations Committee and as chief deputy whip of the Democratic Caucus.

Throughout his career, Congressman Pastor was a passionate advocate for fixing our broken immigration system, for investing in our Nation's transportation infrastructure, and for protecting the civil rights of every American. Perhaps, even more importantly, as President Obama noted, Congressman Pastor served as a mentor and as a role model to young Latinos and Latinas throughout Arizona and our country. He was supported in this groundbreaking work by his loving wife, Verma. Congressman Pastor retired in 2014, and he remains a beloved and respected figure in the city of Phoenix.

I am incredibly proud to follow in his footsteps as the Seventh Congressional District's Representative here in Washington. The Ed Pastor Post Office will join the Ed Pastor Elementary School and the Ed Pastor Center for Politics and Public Service at ASU as monuments to his outstanding service to our Nation. Congressman Pastor's legacy lives on, not just in these buildings, but in the transportation projects he championed, in the legislation he authored, in the working families he helped, and in the young people he inspired.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the support of every Member in recognizing a legendary Arizonan, Congressman Ed Pastor.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4010, a bill "To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the 'Ed Pastor Post Office' ".

I support this bill because it honors the service of Ed Pastor, the first Latino congressman from Arizona.

During Congressman Pastor's 12 terms in Congress, he committed himself to serving thousands of constituents from the 2nd, 4th, and 7th districts in Arizona and all across the country.

As a dedicated and active member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Pastor served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the International Conservation Caucus, and the Sportsmen's Caucus.

Congressman Pastor is also known for his influence in promoting American arts, for protecting nature, and for protecting the civil rights of Americans.

As members of Congress, it is vital that we continue to fight for the rights of our constituents and for all Americans as we actively conserve our precious land and indigenous cultures.

As I am a strong advocate of protecting human and civil rights, I fully support the designation of the United States Postal Service facility as the "Ed Pastor Post Office" in honor of his services to both his country and to his constituents.

I urge all members to join me in passing H.R. 4010 as it rightfully commemorates Ed Pastor's outstanding service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4010.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARRY G. MILLER POST OFFICE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4372) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4372

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BARRY G. MILLER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Barry G. Miller Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Barry G. Miller Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4372, introduced by Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York. This bill designates a post office located in Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

Mr. Miller was assistant chief of Emergency Medical Services, a member of the Bergen Volunteer Fire Department, and a Genesee County coroner. He was tragically killed in the line of duty during an emergency response.

I look forward to hearing more about Barry Miller from the sponsor of the bill, my colleague, Representative COLLINS.

I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4372, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

Along with his love of outdoor activities, including snowmobiling, boating, water-skiing, and camping, Barry exhibited a love for community service. While working as a Genesee County coroner, Barry also served as the chief of Emergency Medical Services at the Bergen Fire Department. As a 31-year veteran of the fire department, Barry is remembered for his generosity and for his dedication to protecting and improving the lives of those in his community.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize Barry Miller's life of public service and to honor the many contributions he made to his community. I urge the passage of H.R. 4372.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you in support of H.R. 4372, a bill to designate the Bergen Post Office as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

It is a great honor to introduce legislation that designates a post office in my district after someone who dedicated his entire life to public service in western New York.

Barry Miller was a lifelong Bergen resident and served as a member of the Bergen Volunteer Fire Department for 31 years, including 10 as the assistant EMS chief. Barry was also the Genesee County coroner, a business owner, and a member of the Bergen Town Board.

Barry was dedicated to helping fellow New Yorkers, and he made numerous lasting contributions to the Bergen and Genesee County communities. Unfortunately, Barry was tragically killed in the line of duty, during an emergency response, on November 23, 2015.

In order to honor his service and memory, the post office will be named the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4372.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4777) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4777

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama, shall be known and designated as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4777, introduced by Representative TERRI SEWELL of Alabama. The bill designates a post office in Selma, Alabama, as the Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.

□ 1545

Mrs. Boynton Robinson was a civil rights leader who marched on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma and fought to ensure equality for all.

I look forward to learning more about Amelia Boynton Robinson's life from my colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative SEWELL.

I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4777, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Selma, Alabama, as the Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.

Known as the matriarch of the civil rights movement, Amelia Boynton Robinson began her activism as a child, along with her mother, on horse-and-buggy trips to pass out women's suffrage pamphlets prior to the 1910s. By 1930, Amelia was helping register southern African American voters.

In 1964, she became the first African American woman to run for Congress in Alabama. Although she lost the Democratic primary, her campaign drew increased interest to the issue of voting rights.

Having participated in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference since meeting Dr. Martin Luther King in 1954, Amelia helped organize the march from Selma to Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to make sure that a place in history that was changed by this woman's leadership commemorates her and her tireless efforts on behalf of civil and voting rights in our country.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4777.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to rise in strong support of H.R. 4777, to designate the United States Post Office at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama, as the Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.

Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson was known as the matriarch of the voting rights movement. Her life and legacy epitomized strength, resiliency, perseverance, and courage, the same characteristics that embody the city of Selma, Alabama, my hometown, where she made such a significant impact.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was named the only female lieutenant to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., during the civil rights movement. In this role, she would travel alongside Dr. King and often appear in his stead for numerous events and gatherings.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was also well known for braving the frontline of the Selma march on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where she was brutally attacked and left for dead on Bloody Sunday, on March 7, 1965. It was the picture of a bloody and beaten Amelia Boynton that appeared on the front page of The New York Times and showed the world the brutality of racism in the fight for voter equality.

During the violent attacks, this heroine never gave up hope, hope in an ideal that is all America. It is democracy. She believed so fervently that all Americans should have the right to vote, and she was willing to die for it.

It was the direct involvement of Amelia Boynton Robinson and the foot soldiers who dared to march from Selma to Montgomery that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. She was such a valued part of this process that some of the contents of the voting rights bill were drafted at her kitchen table in Selma.

A courageous trailblazer even before Bloody Sunday, Amelia Boynton Robinson, on May 5, 1964, broke all barriers as the first Black woman in the State of Alabama to run for Congress. She ran to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, the seat I am so honored to hold today. She garnered 10.7 percent of the vote during a

time when very few Blacks were registered to vote. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the journey that I now take as Alabama's first Black Congresswoman was only made possible because of the courage, tenacity, and faith of Amelia Boynton Robinson.

Last year, before Mrs. Boynton passed, I was honored to have her as my special guest at the State of the Union. It was incredibly moving to see Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle and members of the President's Cabinet line up to greet her and to take pictures with her. Everyone thanked her for her service to this country. Even President Obama came to talk and thank Mrs. Boynton before he gave his address at the State of the Union.

This picture documents that very time when she got to meet the President of the United States for the first time. The memory of that moment will stand as one of the highlights of my time here in Congress. The symbolism of this picture is not lost on any of us. It was truly because of her bravery and the bravery of other foot soldiers who dared to march, like our very own colleague, JOHN LEWIS, that paved the way for the election of this country's first Black President.

Just a few months later, on March 6, 2015, she joined hands with our own President Barack Obama again, to retrace the path that she took across the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, when she and our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, were beaten over 50 years ago. Amelia Boynton Robinson passed away just a few months later on August 26, 2015, at the age of 104.

She was featured prominently in the movie ''Selma'' for her tenacity and her bravery. She truly embodied what they were fighting for as foot soldiers. I was so glad that before her death she was able to cross that bridge one more time, and this time with two Presidents: President Barack Obama and President George Bush. So many of my colleagues joined us that day, and we continue to honor her legacy by supporting this legislation and naming the Selma Post Office in her honor.

As a daughter of Selma, I am honored to sponsor this legislation, and I can think of no one more deserving to have their name on a post office in Selma, Alabama, than Amelia Boynton Robinson. She truly represents the heart, spirit, and essence of Selma, Alabama, and the voting rights movement.

In closing, I am reminded of the words that Amelia Boynton Robinson said during her visit to this Capitol at the State of the Union in 2015. As Members of Congress and Cabinet members took pictures with her in the Halls of this Capitol, they said to Mrs. Robinson: ''I stand on your shoulders. I wouldn't be here if it weren't for you.''

Ms. Boynton finally, after the fifth person said that to her, ''I stand on your shoulders,'' she looked up, as only a person of 104 would, and said, ''Get off my shoulders.'' She said: ''Do your own work. There is plenty of work to be done.''

Mr. Speaker, this august body still has work to do to fully restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which was gutted by the Supreme Court in the Shelby v. Holder decision of 2013. I ask my Republican colleagues to join the 180 members of the Democratic Caucus who have sponsored the Voting Rights Advancement Act. It is this bill that will give back the enforcement arm of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and it is up to Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act.

In memory of Amelia Boynton Robinson, I urge my colleagues to not only support the naming of this post office in H.R. 4777, but they can honor the memory of her and so many of the foot soldiers' bravery by passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. The right to vote is a sacred right, Mr. Speaker, and no American should be denied access to the ballot box.

Ms. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for this bill. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Alabama for her good and great work on this bill.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was a daughter of Georgia who moved to Alabama to study at Tuskegee Institute. After graduating, she began working for the United States Department of Agriculture in Dallas County, Alabama, where Selma is the county seat. This is where Mrs. Boynton met her husband, Samuel Boynton. They raised their sons—Bill, Jr., and Bruce Carver—on the front lines of the fight for equality and civil rights.

I remember going to Selma, Alabama, for the first time in 1963, at the age of 23, to help African Americans gain the right to vote. Mrs. Boynton was one of the first individuals I met. She worked tirelessly. She organized. She mobilized. She spoke. She led. She was fearless.

Mrs. Boynton was one of the very first African Americans to register to vote in Dallas County. The county had an African American majority, but only about 2.1 percent of African Americans of voting age were registered to vote. People had to stand in lines. On occasion, they were asked to count the number of bubbles on a bar of soap, the number of jelly beans in a jar. Occasionally, people had to pass a so-called literacy test.

Time after time, she stood up to brutality and injustice. I remember her very well on Bloody Sunday. Mrs. Boynton was knocked down by Alabama State Troopers and trampled by horses and tear-gassed, but she never gave up. She kept her faith. She kept her eyes on the prize. Mrs. Boynton's vision, determination, and commitment helped to pave the way for the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Last year, when she passed away, at the age of 104, I mourned with the rest of the Nation. I was happy that during her long life she had an opportunity to see the impact of her work.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is so fitting for a post office to be named in her honor. Her work has changed not just Selma, but the entire State of Alabama, the South, our Nation, and inspired people all around our world. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this important bill.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers to bring forth today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 4777, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.''

I support this legislation, because it commemorates Amelia Boynton Robinson's historic role during the Civil Rights Movement.

Not only was Amelia a courageous activist in Selma, Alabama during the height of the Civil Rights Movement, she also taught in Georgia before starting with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Selma as the home demonstration agent for Dallas County.

She educated the county's largely rural population about food production and processing, nutrition, healthcare, and other subjects related to agriculture and homemaking.

We celebrate Amelia for her invaluable contributions to her community and her country.

Amelia worked for the promotion of civil rights for all and protested the continued segregation and disenfranchisement of African Americans.

Amelia registered to vote, which was extremely difficult for African Americans to accomplish in Alabama due to discriminatory practices under the state's reactionary constitution passed at the turn of the century.

Amelia Boynton Robinson made her home and office in Selma a center for strategy sessions for Selma's civil rights battles, including its voting rights campaign.

In 1964, Amelia ran for the Congress from Alabama, with the intent to encourage African Americans to register and vote.

This made Amelia the first female African American to run for office in Alabama and the first woman of any race to run for office as a candidate of the Democratic party in the state of Alabama.

Amelia is also known for her role in Selma to Montgomery marches, where she worked alongside Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Coretta Scott King, our beloved colleague Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and other monumental figures in the epochal struggle to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Amelia helped organize a march to the state capital of Montgomery, which became known

as "Bloody Sunday" when county and state police stopped the march and beat demonstrators.

Amelia was beaten unconscious and a newspaper of her lying bloody and beaten drew national attention to the cause.

Men and women like Amelia marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

Bloody Sunday led to the passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965, which was signed by President Lyndon Johnson on August 6, 1965, in the presence of Amelia Boynton Robinson, with Boynton attending as the landmark event's guest of honor.

Amelia was awarded the Martin Luther King Jr. Medal of Freedom and toured the United States on behalf of the Schiller Institute until 2009.

Mr. Speaker, naming the post office in honor of Amelia Boynton Robinson is a special and deserved commemoration of her life of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4777.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL GARVER OXLEY MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4925) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, as the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4925

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MICHAEL GARVER OXLEY MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4925, introduced by Representative ROBERT LATTA of Ohio. The bill designates a post office in Findlay, Ohio, as the Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building.

Former Representative Oxley served in the House of Representatives from 1981 until 2007, including as chairman of the House Financial Services Committee.

□ 1600

I look forward to hearing more about former Representative Oxley from my colleague and the bill's sponsor, Representative LATTA. For now, I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4925, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Findlay, Ohio, as the Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building.

Mr. Oxley was elected to the Ohio State House of Representatives at the age of 28 and won a special election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1981. Serving as the chair of the Committee on Financial Services, Congressman Oxley devoted himself to corporate oversight and insurance protection issues. He also led efforts to investigate Enron and other corporate scandals, and is perhaps most well known for the new accounting requirements and financial regulations enacted by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

Congressman Oxley retired after 25 years in the House and passed away in December of 2015, following a battle with lung cancer.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor Congressman Oxley's public service and commemorate his many congressional accomplishments.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4925.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4925, my legislation which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service at 229 West Main Cross Street in Findlay, Ohio, as the Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building.

This bipartisan legislation will honor a great legislator, friend, and former Congressman Mike Oxley for his many years of dedicated public service.

Mike received his undergraduate degree from Miami University, which he was always very proud of, and he was always very proud of the fact that is where my youngest daughter just received her undergraduate degree this past May. He received his JD from the Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, and after that, he began his career in public service as a special agent for the FBI in 1969.

After serving with the FBI for 3 years, Mike was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives in 1972. That is when I first met Mike, out on the campaign trail. Mike served admirably in the House until 1981, when he won a special election after the death of Congressman Tennyson Guyer, also of Findlay. As was noted, Mike served then from 1981 until his retirement in 2007 here in the United States House of Representatives, which he loved.

In the 107th, 108th, and 109th Congresses, Mike was elected to serve as the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, and he had many, many friends, but Mike personified what a true public servant was and is. He served his constituents from Ohio well and served the United States well.

When you talk about what a public servant is, my dad always told me that a public servant is a person who sees how much they can always give of themselves to the people they represent, and Mike did that.

Aside from his government service, Mike also served and was dedicated to helping others through his charitable works. As a team captain for the annual congressional baseball game—in one of them he got his leg broken—Mike and his colleagues helped raise thousands of dollars for the Washington Literacy Center, the Washington Nationals Dream Foundation, and the Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Washington.

Mike was also very active back home not only with Miami University, but also with the University of Findlay; and he was also active in helping raise funds for the greater Findlay area.

I would like to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their work in advancing this bill through the committee and to the House floor. I would also like to thank the entire Ohio delegation and other Members for supporting this legislation as cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to join me in honoring the memory of Mike Oxley by passing H.R. 4925.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I just wanted to take an opportunity, especially from this side of the aisle, to hear from someone who worked with Mike, who had great admiration for him, and that is myself.

When I was a young man, elected at 36 years of age back in 1998, one of the first people I met on the other side of

the aisle—not from my home State—was Mike Oxley. He had great admiration for my predecessor as well, and they were good friends, Tom Manton.

Mike was also my chairman. I served on the House Committee on Financial Services after the attacks of 9/11, and one of the great tributes I think I can give to Mike Oxley is he was, in large part, responsible for the passing of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, also known as TRIA, something that was desperately needed after the events of 9/11 to shore up the financial services industry and industry all around the country and real estate. In so many, many ways, he understood the ramifications that not having that backstop could potentially have for our country. He saw to it that a bipartisan bill was agreed to.

So I have nothing but fond memories of Mike. I was very saddened when I heard of Michael's illness. I know he is missed by his family. On a lighter note, this week we will play the annual congressional baseball game. I am sure that if my colleagues were here on the floor, Coach Doyle in particular would be pointing out that he and Mike had a good friendship.

Mike was also a good basketball player. He had a wicked 3-point shot. Maybe if the 3-point play had been in place when he was in high school, he might have been somebody, you never know.

But Mike Oxley certainly was someone and a treasure to this institution, this body. He was a real Member's Member. I think if you can leave this House and have a tribute by someone from this side in a personal way speak about you, as I am today, I think that speaks highly of Michael Oxley. He is missed. What a great thing to do to honor him by naming this post office in his honor.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make Congresswoman LAWRENCE aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM), my colleague, that I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4925.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH M. CHRISTY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4960) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4960

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. KENNETH M. CHRISTY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4960, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER). The bill designates a post office in Aurora, Illinois, as the Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.

Mr. Christy was a dedicated employee of the United States Postal Service and a devoted advocate for postal employees. I look forward to hearing more about Mr. Christy from my colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative FOSTER. For now, I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4960, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Aurora, Illinois, as the Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.

It is only fitting that we name a post office after Ken Christy, a man who dedicated his career to the Postal Service and its workforce. Joining the Aurora Post Office in 1977, Ken worked as a letter carrier for over 30 years. Ken also served 25 years as the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers Branch 219, receiving multiple awards for his dedication, leadership, and community service.

In 2004, he joined the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers. Ken was awarded honorary membership in numerous postal facilities outside of Aurora and was inducted into the Illinois Letter Carriers Hall of Fame in 2012.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about my illustrious career in the United States Postal Service, one of 30 years. I started that career as a letter carrier, so it is with great honor that I stand here today strongly suggesting and saying that we should pass this bill to honor Ken Christy's life of public service and his tireless dedication to the Postal Service. I urge the passage of H.R. 4960.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan, and I also thank the entire Illinois delegation on both sides of the aisle for cosponsoring this legislation.

On March 26, 2016, the State of Illinois and the city of Aurora lost a consummate public servant. On the day he died, Ken Christy was the sitting Aurora township clerk, the president of the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers, and a dear friend of mine.

Ken was a family man, and he left behind three daughters and his wife, Bonnie, his high school sweetheart to whom he was married for 52 years. I rise today to honor Ken's legacy and his lifetime of public service.

Ken and his wife, Bonnie, settled in Aurora in 1977, when Ken took a job as a letter carrier with the United States Postal Service, a career that would last more than 30 years. Ken took on a leadership role within the Postal Service. He quickly became the Aurora NALC Branch 219 president and served in that role for 25 years.

During that time, Branch 219 was recognized for its charitable contributions and received several awards from the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Under Ken's leadership, Branch 219 was recognized nationally with an NALC Branch Service Award and its Humanitarian Award. Ken spent countless hours as a volunteer at the letter carriers' annual Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive and made deliveries for the Northern Illinois Food Bank.

In 2000, Ken was personally awarded the Dave Bybee award for leadership and dedication by the Illinois Association of Letter Carriers.

In 2004, he was recognized for his leadership skills and civic engagement by becoming its legislative liaison.

Just 3 years later, he was elected president of the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers, a position he held until the end of his life.

□ 1615

As president of the Illinois Association of Letter Carriers, Ken made sure

that the voices of his members were heard by public officials on both sides of the aisle at both the State and Federal level.

In 2012, Ken was nominated to the Illinois Letter Carriers Hall of Fame. In 2013, Ken Christy was elected Clerk of Aurora Township.

Ken was a public servant in the truest sense of the word. Ken was always working for others, whether it was in his 30-year career delivering mail in his community, his dedication to charity work, or his devotion to his family as a husband, father, and grandfather.

So I think it is only appropriate that we honor his life and his legacy and pass this bill today to name the post office where Ken spent his entire career the Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this man, who was a pillar of his community, by voting ''yes.''

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4960.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANSION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AVAILABILITY PAY TO EMPLOYEES OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION'S AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4902) to amend title 5, United States Code, to expand law enforcement availability pay to employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4902

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LAW ENFORCEMENT AVAILABILITY PAY FOR EMPLOYEES OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION'S AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5545a(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''apply to a pilot employed by the United States Customs Service'' and inserting ''apply to any employee of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations, or any successor organization,''; and

(2) by striking ''such pilot'' and inserting ''such employee''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after the date that is 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4902.

Those who serve along our Nation's borders make countless sacrifices protecting the homeland in the most literal of ways by stopping bad guys from entering our country and harming Americans.

The Customs and Border Protection officers and agents who serve in my district, which covers over 800 miles of the Texas-Mexico border, have an increasingly challenging job. Not only do they keep us safe from terrorists and drug cartels, but they also apprehend illegal contraband and rescue victims of human trafficking.

CBP's Air and Marine Operations, or AMO, patrols our Nation's borders by aircraft and vessels, specifically. AMO is made up of over 1,200 Federal agents, 250 aircraft, and over 280 marine vessels, operating from 91 locations throughout the United States and Puerto Rico.

These brave agents are often required to work long, unpredictable hours and are compensated through various confusing and inconsistent pay systems, causing an administrative nightmare for the folks who work overtime protecting our Nation.

Because of the number of overtime systems applicable to AMO agents, in many cases, even those working side by side on a mission were often compensated differently. The confusion and inconsistency not only makes it harder for the agency to plan shifts for agents and to prepare a budget, but the uncertainty impacts those who serve.

H.R. 4902 addresses these problems by standardizing premium pay for AMO. Under the provisions of this bill, all law enforcement agents at AMO will be covered under the Law Enforcement Availability Pay, otherwise known as LEAP, the LEAP premium pay system.

To ensure pay is standardized quickly, the legislation would require this change to come into force on the first day of the pay period that begins at least 14 days after the date of enactment.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing a uniform pay system for all CBP officers would result in a cost savings of approximately $2 million annually. More importantly, it would save many hard-working AMO officers from unfair and aggravating overtime pay discrepancies. This will save Customs and Border Protection valuable time and operational bandwidth, while ensuring taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association in support of this bill.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of membership of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA)—the nation's largest professional, non-profit association representing 26,000 federal law enforcement officers from 65 agencies—I am writing to advise you of our continued strong support for H.R. 4902, legislation to expand Law Enforcement Availability Pay (LEAP) to the law enforcement officers of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations division. FLEOA greatly appreciates the Committee's efforts to expeditiously approve this important legislation, and we urge its passage by the House of Representatives this week.

Currently, within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), law enforcement officers of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's (CBP) Air and Maritime Operation (AMO) division are compensated through multiple premium pay mechanisms for their overtime: Administratively Uncontrollable Overtime (AUO), Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), Law Enforcement Availability Pay (LEAP) and Title 5 overtime (FEPA). This proposal would harmonize premium pay across the organization by making all AMO law enforcement officers eligible for LEAP. CBP estimates that shifting overtime compensation to LEAP will help the agency save approximately $1.6 million in premium pay in the first year alone.

Prior to the creation of the DHS, all U.S. Customs Service air personnel were included in the LEAP statute. Legacy U.S. Customs Service responsibilities have been retained, but today's AMO functions encompass a broader scope of authorities. Implementing LEAP for all AMO law enforcement officers would enhance CBP operational efficiencies and monetary savings by providing an efficient, effective, and uniform system of compensation for the unique work conditions and substantial hours commonly required of AMO agents.

FLEOA appreciates your efforts to advance this legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any additional information or assistance.

Respectfully,

DOMINICK L. STOKES,
FLEOA Vice President for Legislative Affairs.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4902, a bipartisan bill sponsored by

some of my colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representatives HURD, CONNOLLY, and LUJAN GRISHAM. I thank them for their good work on this important legislation.

This legislation would establish a uniform pay system for law enforcement officers of the Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations, who are currently paid overtime pay under three different systems; and it will make it more efficient for the agency to administer staff overtime.

The bill will convert the pay system for AMO officers to Law Enforcement Availability Pay, a system used by many other Federal agencies, including the FBI, DEA, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

As stated by my colleague, Mr. HURD, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this legislation will reduce AMO's costs by $2 million a year.

I would also like to note that the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association supports this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4902.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4902.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRAUD REDUCTION AND DATA ANALYTICS ACT OF 2015

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2133) to improve Federal agency financial and administrative controls and procedures to assess and mitigate fraud risks, and to improve Federal agencies' development and use of data analytics for the purpose of identifying, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2133

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''improper payment'' has the meaning given the term in section 2(g) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS RELATING TO FRAUD AND IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

(a) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall establish guidelines for agencies to establish financial and administrative controls to identify and assess fraud risks and design and implement control activities in order to prevent, detect, and respond to fraud, including improper payments.

(2) CONTENTS.—The guidelines described in paragraph (1) shall incorporate the leading practices identified in the report published by the Government Accountability Office on July 28, 2015, entitled ''Framework for Managing Fraud Risks in Federal Programs''.

(3) MODIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, may periodically modify the guidelines described in paragraph (1) as the Director and Comptroller General may determine necessary.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTROLS.—The financial and administrative controls required to be established by agencies under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) conducting an evaluation of fraud risks and using a risk-based approach to design and implement financial and administrative control activities to mitigate identified fraud risks;

(2) collecting and analyzing data from reporting mechanisms on detected fraud to monitor fraud trends and using that data and information to continuously improve fraud prevention controls; and

(3) using the results of monitoring, evaluation, audits, and investigations to improve fraud prevention, detection, and response.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each of the first 3 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency shall submit to Congress, as part of the annual financial report of the agency, a report on the progress of the agency in—

(A) implementing—

(i) the financial and administrative controls required to be established under subsection (a);

(ii) the fraud risk principle in the Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government; and

(iii) Office of Management and Budget Circular A–123 with respect to the leading practices for managing fraud risk;

(B) identifying risks and vulnerabilities to fraud, including with respect to payroll, beneficiary payments, grants, large contracts, and purchase and travel cards; and

(C) establishing strategies, procedures, and other steps to curb fraud.

(2) FIRST REPORT.—If the date of enactment of this Act is less than 180 days before the date on which an agency is required to submit the annual financial report of the agency, the agency may submit the report required under paragraph (1) as part of the following annual financial report of the agency.

SEC. 4. WORKING GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a working group to improve—

(1) the sharing of financial and administrative controls established under section 3(a) and other best practices and techniques for detecting, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments; and

(2) the sharing and development of data analytics techniques.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall be composed of—

(1) the Controller of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as Chairperson;

(2) the Chief Financial Officer of each agency; and

(3) any other party determined to be appropriate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, which may include the Chief Information Officer, the Chief Procurement Officer, or the Chief Operating Officer of each agency.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall consult with Offices of Inspectors General and Federal and non-Federal experts on fraud risk assessments, financial controls, and other relevant matters.

(d) MEETINGS.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall hold not fewer than 4 meetings per year.

(e) PLAN.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the working group established under subsection (a) shall submit to Congress a plan for the establishment and use of a Federal interagency library of data analytics and data sets, which can incorporate or improve upon existing Federal resources and capacities, for use by agencies and Offices of Inspectors General to facilitate the detection, prevention, and recovery of fraud, including improper payments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2133, the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015, introduced by Senator THOMAS CARPER of Delaware.

S. 2133 is a bipartisan bill that will strengthen and enhance the antifraud prevention and detection measures used by Federal agencies. Current antifraud prevention and detection measures are reliant on after-the-fact reviews of transactions. This system is not perfect.

A significant portion of the Federal Government's $124 billion in overpayments in fiscal year 2014—$19 billion more than fiscal year 2013—were fraud-related.

The current reactive antifraud measures require agencies to spend time and resources on efforts to track and recover these fraud-related overpayments. S. 2133 will help to prevent

these fraudulent payments from being made in the first place.

The Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015 will help protect taxpayer dollars by requiring the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, and Federal agencies to adopt proactive fraud detection controls and preventative measures.

The bill will require the OMB to create a set of guidelines for antifraud measures, which agencies must utilize when establishing their proactive antifraud control and detection procedures. The bill will also require agencies to better collaborate on developing best practices for combating fraud.

S. 2133 also requires that agencies create an interagency working group in order to share best practices and crucial fraud prevention data, such as the Social Security Administration's data to prevent payments to deceased individuals.

Mr. Speaker, passing S. 2133 and requiring agencies to adopt a proactive antifraud approach will not only serve to protect taxpayer dollars, but increase public confidence in the administration of government programs, especially benefit programs.

I would like to thank Senator CARPER and Senator THOM TILLIS for introducing this good government legislation, and I would like to thank the Subcommittee on Government Operations chairman MARK MEADOWS for championing this bill in the House.

I urge Members to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act is designed to strengthen Federal agency efforts to combat financial fraud. Congress has passed a number of bills in the past few years aimed at curbing improper payments. Fraud in this area is especially harmful. It stems not from innocent mistakes, but from the willful intent to steal or misuse taxpayer dollars.

Fraud reduction strategies help reduce these crimes, and the Government Accountability Office and the inspector general have recommended that agencies implement such strategies.

The bill before us will require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consult with GAO to develop antifraud guidance for Federal agencies and then monitor the implementation of this guidance.

The bill will also require the establishment of a working group of agency chief financial officers to share best practices and help disseminate new antifraud techniques. The working group would also be required to develop a plan for establishing an interagency library of analytical tools and datasets for agencies and IGs to use in fighting fraud.

In developing this plan, I believe the working group should look to the model of the Recovery Operations Center, which was developed to monitor spending under the Recovery Act of 2009, and which has, unfortunately, ceased operations.

These are commonsense steps toward solving a serious problem that everyone should support. I urge members to support S. 2133.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank Chairman HURD for his leadership not only on this, but on so many important topics here in this body. He certainly is looking after transparency and oversight on behalf of the American people. I just would like to applaud his leadership there.

□ 1630

I am proud today, Mr. Speaker, to rise in support of S. 2133, the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015. S. 2133 is a bipartisan bill that will provide agencies a critically important measure for defeating fraud and protecting taxpayer dollars.

In fiscal year 2014, the GAO reported that a significant portion of the $124 billion in improper payments were related to fraud. To make matters worse, all the improper payments increased by a total of $19 billion—that is billion with a B—from the previous fiscal year.

Given the cost of these improper payments to agencies and, as a result, to the taxpayers, something must be done to block the flow of these fraudulent and improper payments. S. 2133 will provide the necessary framework around which agencies can build a strong antifraud defense system.

Currently, agencies have been overreliant on an after-the-fact antifraud detection measure which requires the agency to review payments after they have been made and then make an attempt to recoup them. S. 2113 actually would require these agencies to develop proactive measures to identify risk, to analyze known cases of fraud, and then to develop strategies to prevent future fraud. It will also protect the American taxpayer dollars from fraud by requiring agencies to better share data that can be used to fight fraud.

This bill will create a working group of agencies where best practices and fraud detection and prevention strategies can be shared throughout the government. By combating fraud, agencies will not only protect taxpayer dollars, but also increase the trust and confidence in the administration of government programs.

I would like to thank Senator CARPER and Senator TILLIS for introducing this important, good-government legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and help better protect the American taxpayer dollars by voting in favor of S. 2133.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2133.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEANNE AND JULES MANFORD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2607) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JEANNE AND JULES MANFORD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2607, introduced by Representative JOSEPH CROWLEY of New York. The bill designates a post office in Jackson Heights, New York, as the Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building.

Jeanne and Jules Manford were activists in the community and loving parents. I look forward to hearing more about Mr. and Mrs. Manford from my

colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative CROWLEY. For now, I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2607, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Jackson Heights, New York, as the Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building.

Parents of gay activist Morty Manford, Jeanne and Jules Manford quickly became activists themselves, following their son's beating at a Gay Activists Alliance demonstration in 1972. Morty had been kicked and beaten, yet police did not intercede on his behalf. Jeanne wrote a letter, published in the New York Post, highlighting her outrage and drawing public attention to violence being perpetrated against the LGBT community.

A year later, in 1973, Jeanne and Jules Manford decided to organize a support group for parents of gay children. By the 1980s, their group was formally established as Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays. PFLAG is now an international group made up of over 200,000 members advocating for support, understanding, and equal rights for gay, lesbian, transgender, and bisexual individuals.

In 1993, almost a year after losing Morty to complications of AIDS, Jeanne Manford served as the grand marshal of the New York Gay Pride Parade. Following her death in 2013, Jeanne was awarded the Nation's second highest civilian award, the Presidential Citizens Medal, by President Barack Obama.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize Jeanne and Jules Manford's tireless devotion to the LGBT equal rights movement and their advocacy on its behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a very sad time in our history where we are witnessing, unfortunately, violence and hate being perpetrated on members of our country, the citizens and people who have identified themselves as gay or lesbian.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 2607, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Before I begin, I want to thank my colleague, Ranking Member LAWRENCE, for her support on the Interior Subcommittee as well as the full committee, Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Chairman CHAFFETZ of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for working with us to bring this bill to the floor.

I am so pleased to have this chance to honor Jeanne and Jules Manford and their history of community engagement by naming the Jackson Heights Post Office, which is situated in Queens, New York, which is squarely in the middle of my congressional district.

I also want to thank Suzanne Swan, Jeanne and Jules' daughter, and PFLAG for collaborating with me on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, the timing of this bill, as my colleague from Michigan just said, could not be a more opportune moment. It comes in the wake of last Sunday's terrible attack on the LGBT community in Orlando, an attack that was motivated by hate.

We stand here today to honor two individuals who, when faced with a hateful act of violence themselves against their son, were inspired to start a movement couched in acceptance and support.

Jeanne and Jules Manford were your typical middle class Queens, New Yorkers, who worked hard to make a better life for themselves, their families, and for their community. Jeanne was a public schoolteacher in Flushing, Queens. Jules was a dentist. The couple worked with a number of local community groups helping to make Queens a better place to live.

And they raised two children, Suzanne and Morty, in whom they instilled the values of hard work, compassion, and public service. Morty was lucky to have two loving parents who accepted him for who he was at a time when the acceptance of LGBT people was, unfortunately, the exception rather than the rule.

While a student at Columbia and Cardozo Law School and throughout his career, Morty stood up for the rights of the LGBT community and, like his parents, sought to make life better for those around him. He was one of those many present at the Stonewall riots in Greenwich Village in 1969, and he continued to organize protests in order to draw attention to issues affecting the LGBT community.

Following one of those protests in April of 1972, Morty was severely beaten. In a trial following the beating, witnesses testified that they saw Morty thrown down an escalator and then kicked and stomped on. Thankfully, those injuries were not fatal. Morty did recover. But his parents, Jeanne and Jules, were galvanized to take their own actions to counter hate and to counter discrimination.

The following June, in the Christopher Street Liberation Day Parade, the predecessor to New York's Pride Parade, Jeanne Manford carried a now-famous sign that read: ''Parents of Gays Unite in Support for Our Children.'' The image of Jeanne and her defiance and call to action in the face of bigotry and violence became a celebrated artifact in the history of the gay rights movement.

This is an iconic photo in the gay rights movement. It shows the face of a proud mother who refuses to accept that her child should be mistreated because of who he is. More importantly, this picture, and this particular sign, document the inception of a new approach to achieving equality, an effort by parents and families to stand up for their LGBT children. In that moment, now 44 years, almost to this day, Jeanne embodied the spirit that has now come to guide a national organization known as PFLAG.

In the wake of Morty Manford's harrowing beating, Jeanne and Jules realized that, even as LGBT people continue to fight for justice and acceptance, their work can be amplified through the support of their allies. And who better to be an ally than one's own supportive family?

It was with this in mind that Jeanne and Jules founded an organization known as Parents of Gays. With their spirit of community involvement, Jeanne and Jules wanted to help others like them, friends and neighbors and colleagues, to help understand and support their LGBT children. They held their first support group meeting in 1973 in the Church of the Village, a uniquely accepting and progressive Methodist Church in Greenwich Village, and it is still active today.

At a time when attitudes toward sexual orientation were only just beginning to change, the founding of an organization designed to bring in, educate, and support those closest to the LGBT individuals, their parents, was critical in advancing acceptance and equal rights.

Over the next few years, similar organizations were started all around the country, and their representatives were finally brought together following the 1979 National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights. A couple of years later, following important work establishing themselves as the source of information and support, various chapters decided to launch a national organization called Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, now known as PFLAG. And from there, the organization's efforts took off.

PFLAG began work on national policy issues, such as stopping the military from discharging lesbian servicemembers. And it worked to help establish hundreds of chapters in rural communities where LGBT individuals and their families had a more difficult time finding and coordinating with others like them. Today, PFLAG counts over 350 chapters and more than 200,000 members in all 50 States, and similar organizations have been established around the world.

Jeanne and Jules continued to work in their community, helping to found a PFLAG chapter in Queens, alongside the LGBT equal rights activist and my good friend, Danny Dromm, now a member of the New York City Council. Jeanne went on to become an advocate for people with HIV and AIDS, following Morty's death from the disease in 1992 at the young age of just 41.

For her many years of work in support of the LGBT community, Jeanne was honored as the first Grand Marshal of the Queens Pride Parade, which began in 1993, the year after Morty's death. The parade runs through the heart of my district in Queens and passes a reviewing stand situated directly in front of the post office we are renaming today in Jackson Heights. In fact, the street corner next to this post office was itself renamed for someone we lost to a senseless act of hate. Julio Rivera, a young man, was killed in 1990 at the age of 29, targeted because he, himself, was gay.

Jackson Heights is a thriving neighborhood with a growing LGBT community, and our community will be honored to have our local post office bear the names of Jeanne and Jules Manford. These symbols remind us of how far we have come.

After Jules Manford passed away, Jeanne, having lost her husband and son, eventually went to live with her daughter, Suzanne, in California.

□ 1645

In January of 2013, just a few months before the Supreme Court's landmark decision overturning the Defense of Marriage Act, Jeanne passed away at the age of 92. That same year, Jeanne was honored posthumously with the Presidential Citizens Medal for her efforts.

It is difficult to imagine how we could have achieved so much progress toward attaining more equal rights for LGBT Americans without the work of Jeanne and Jules Manford more than 40 years ago.

Though the LGBT community itself had already begun to organize and demand action, it was the Manfords' work to bring families and allies into the fold that helped push these issues to the fore.

Many attribute the shift in public opinion on the issue of marriage equality to the simple fact that gay and lesbian people are able to be more open about who they are. As a result, more and more straight Americans know someone who is gay or lesbian or bisexual or transgender and want their friends and family to be treated equally.

This is thanks, in no small part, to the supportive work of the PFLAG and its chapters throughout the years, and to the movement by parents and families who proudly choose to love their children for who they are. So as we celebrate Pride Month, I am glad we have this opportunity to reflect upon and honor those who helped get us to where we are today.

As we mourn in the wake of the tragic shooting at the Pulse LGBT nightclub in Orlando last week, I hope we all can emulate the way Jeanne and Jules Manford responded to their son's beating. The Manfords recognized that violent acts of hate don't show strength. Far from it. They show weakness in the soul of the offender.

Instead of recoiling in fear, the Manfords reacted with a sign of love, support, and solidarity. I have been heartened to see millions of Americans do the same over this past week. It has shown our strength as a society and as a nation in spite of an attack meant to shake us.

So I am particularly glad that we are able to consider this legislation today to honor Jeanne and Jules Manford for all they have done for Queens, for New York, and for America, and I look forward to seeing this become law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of you who are responsible for bringing this bill to the floor today for its consideration. I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we close out the naming of our post offices, I want to take this time to just awaken this body and America on how the naming of post offices take the legacy of American citizens and allow us to celebrate them, remember them, and to create a sense of history in the communities where they live and serve.

Just to sum up the post offices that we have named today: Mary E. McCoy, an activist for women and African Americans; Ed Pastor, who was a Congressman; Barry Miller, an emergency responder; Amelia Robinson, a civil rights activist; Michael Oxley, a Member of Congress; Kenneth Christy, a letter carrier; and Jeanne and Jules Manford, LGBT activists.

Again, today, we have shown America that we recognize the service of those who on their own desire, will, and passion have served our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2607.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTOR GENERAL EMPOWERMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2395) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. FULL AND PROMPT ACCESS TO ALL DOCUMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)(1) to read as follows:

''(1)(A) notwithstanding any other provision of law, except any provision of law enacted by Congress that expressly refers to an Inspector General and expressly limits the right of access by that Inspector General, to have timely access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other materials available to the applicable establishment which relate to programs and operations with respect to which that Inspector General has responsibilities under this Act; and

''(B) except as provided in subsection (i), with regard to Federal grand jury materials protected from disclosure pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e), to have timely access to such information if the Attorney General grants the request in accordance with subsection (g);''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO REQUEST FOR FEDERAL GRAND JURY MATERIALS.—

''(1) TRANSMISSION OF REQUEST TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—If the Inspector General of an establishment submits a request to the head of the establishment for Federal grand jury materials pursuant to subsection (a)(1), the head of the establishment shall immediately notify the Attorney General of such request.

''(2) ATTORNEY GENERAL DETERMINATION.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which a request is submitted to the Attorney General under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall determine whether to grant or deny the request for Federal grand jury materials and shall immediately notify the head of the establishment of such determination. The Attorney General shall grant the request unless the Attorney General determines that granting access to the Federal grand jury materials would be likely to—

''(A) interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution;

''(B) interfere with an undercover operation;

''(C) result in disclosure of the identity of a confidential source, including a protected witness;

''(D) pose a serious threat to national security; or

''(E) result in significant impairment of the trade or economic interests of the United States.

''(3) TRANSMITTAL OF DETERMINATION TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

''(A) NOTIFICATION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DETERMINATION.—The head of the establishment shall inform the Inspector General of the establishment of the determination made by the Attorney General with respect to the request for Federal grand jury materials.

''(B) COMMENTS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the establishment described under subparagraph (A) may submit comments on the determination submitted pursuant to such subparagraph to the committees listed under paragraph (4) that the Inspector General considers appropriate.

''(4) SUBMISSION OF DENIALS TO CONGRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after notifying the head of an establishment of a denial pursuant to paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall submit a statement that the request for Federal grand jury materials by the Inspector General was denied and the reason for the denial to each of the following:

''(A) The Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Judiciary of the Senate.

''(B) The Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

''(C) Other appropriate committees and subcommittees of Congress.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as authorizing an Inspector General to publicly disclose information otherwise prohibited from disclosure by law.

''(i) EXCEPTION.—Subsections (a)(1)(B) and (g) shall not apply to requests from the Inspector General of the Department of Justice.''.

(b) SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—Section 8E(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and insert ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) shall have access under section 6(a)(1)(A) to information available to the Department of Justice under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e).''.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.

(a) SUBPOENA AUTHORITY FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL TO REQUIRE TESTIMONY OF CERTAIN PERSONS.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

''SEC. 6A. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.

''(a) TESTIMONIAL SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.—In addition to the authority otherwise provided by this Act and in accordance with the requirements of this section, each Inspector General, in carrying out the provisions of this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the provisions of the authorizing statute), is authorized to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses as necessary in the performance of the functions assigned to the Inspector General by this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the functions assigned by the authorizing statute), in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate United States district court. An Inspector General may not require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of any current Federal employees, but may use other authorized procedures.

''(b) NONDELEGATION.—The authority to issue a subpoena under subsection (a) may not be delegated.

''(c) PANEL REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE.—

''(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—

''(A) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL BY SUBPOENA PANEL.—Before the issuance of a subpoena described in subsection (a), an Inspector General shall submit a request for approval to issue a subpoena to a panel (in this section, referred to as the 'Subpoena Panel'), which shall be comprised of three Inspectors General of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, who shall be designated by the Inspector General serving as Chairperson of the Council.

''(B) PROTECTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—The information contained in the request submitted by an Inspector General under subparagraph (A) and the identification of a witness shall be protected from disclosure to the extent permitted by law. Any request for disclosure of such information shall be submitted to the Inspector General requesting the subpoena.

''(2) TIME TO RESPOND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Subpoena Panel shall approve or deny a request for approval to issue a subpoena not later than 10 days after the submission of such request.

''(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR PANEL.—If the Subpoena Panel determines that additional information is necessary to approve or deny such request, the Subpoena Panel shall request such information and shall approve or deny such request not later than 20 days after the submission of such request.

''(3) DENIAL BY PANEL.—If a majority of the Subpoena Panel denies the approval of a subpoena, that subpoena may not be issued.

''(d) NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Subpoena Panel approves a subpoena under subsection (c), the Inspector General shall notify the Attorney General that the Inspector General intends to issue the subpoena.

''(2) DENIAL FOR INTERFERENCE WITH AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 10 days after the date on which the Attorney General is notified pursuant to paragraph (1), the Attorney General may object to the issuance of the subpoena because the subpoena will interfere with an ongoing investigation and the subpoena may not be issued.

''(3) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA APPROVED.—If the Attorney General does not object to the issuance of the subpoena during the ten-day period described in paragraph (2), the Inspector General may issue the subpoena.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—The Chairperson of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(f) INSPECTOR GENERAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Inspector General' includes each Inspector General established under this Act and each Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act.

''(g) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this section shall not affect the exercise of authority by an Inspector General of testimonial subpoena authority established under another provision of law.'';

(2) in section 5(a)—

(A) in paragraph (15), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(17) a description of the use of subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of certain witnesses authorized under section 6A.''; and

(3) in section 8G(g)(1), by inserting ''6A,'' before ''and 7''.

(b) MATCHING PROGRAM AND PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT EXCEPTION FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) In this subsection, the terms 'agency', 'matching program', 'record', and 'system of records' have the meanings given those terms in section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) For purposes of section 552a of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, a computerized comparison of 2 or more automated Federal systems of records, or a computerized comparison of a Federal system of records with other records or non-Federal records, performed by an Inspector General or by an agency in coordination with an Inspector General in conducting an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or other review authorized under this Act shall not be considered a matching program.

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impede the exercise by an Inspector General of any matching program authority established under any other provision of law.

''(h) Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the collection of information during the conduct of an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or other review conducted by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency or any Office of Inspector General, including any Office of Special Inspector General.''.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY.

(a) FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF COUNCIL.—Section 11(c)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (H) as subparagraph (I); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following new subparagraph:

''(H) except for any investigation, inspection, audit, or review conducted under section 103H of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033), receive, review, and mediate any disputes submitted in writing to the Council by an Office of Inspector General regarding an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or project that involves the jurisdiction of more than one Federal agency or entity; and''.

(b) INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.—Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) not later than 60 days after the date on which an allegation of wrongdoing is received by the Integrity Committee, make a determination whether the Integrity Committee will initiate an investigation of such allegation under this subsection.'';

(2) in paragraph (6)(B)(i), by striking ''may provide resources'' and inserting ''shall provide assistance''; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by inserting at the end the following new subclauses:

''(V) creating a regular rotation of Inspectors General assigned to investigate complaints through the Integrity Committee; and

''(VI) creating procedures to avoid conflicts of interest for Integrity Committee investigations.'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) COMPLETION OF INVESTIGATION.—If a determination is made under paragraph (5) to initiate an investigation, the Integrity Committee—

''(i) shall complete the investigation not later than six months after the date on which the Integrity Committee made such determination;

''(ii) if the investigation cannot be completed within such six-month period, shall—

''(I) promptly notify the congressional committees listed in paragraph (8)(A)(iii); and

''(II) to the maximum extent practicable, complete the investigation not later than 3 months after the expiration of the six-month period; and

''(iii) if the investigation cannot be completed within such nine-month period, shall brief the congressional committees listed in paragraph (8)(A)(iii) every thirty days until the investigation is complete.

''(D) CONCURRENT INVESTIGATION.—If an investigation of an allegation of wrongdoing against an Inspector General or a staff member of an Office of Inspector General described under paragraph (4)(C) is initiated by a governmental entity other than the Integrity Committee, the Integrity Committee may conduct any related investigation for which a determination to initiate an investigation was made under paragraph (5) concurrently with the other government entity.''.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION; DESIGNEE AUTHORITY.—Section 11 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B) by striking ''Office of the Director of National Intelligence'' and inserting ''Intelligence Community''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''or the designee of the Special Counsel'' before the period at the end; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''or the designee of the Director'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978 AND THE INSPECTOR GENERAL REFORM ACT OF 2008.

(a) INCORPORATION OF PROVISIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL REFORM ACT OF 2008 INTO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING AGAINST SPECIAL COUNSEL OR DEPUTY SPECIAL COUNSEL.—

''(A) SPECIAL COUNSEL DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'Special Counsel' means the Special Counsel appointed under section 1211(b) of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) AUTHORITY OF INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An allegation of wrongdoing against the Special Counsel or the Deputy Special Counsel may be received, reviewed, and referred for investigation by the Integrity Committee to the same extent and in the same manner as in the case of an allegation against an Inspector General (or a member of the staff of an Office of Inspector General), subject to the requirement that the Special Counsel recuse himself or herself from the consideration of any allegation brought under this paragraph.

''(ii) COORDINATION WITH EXISTING PROVISIONS OF LAW.—This paragraph does not eliminate access to the Merit Systems Protection Board for review under section 7701 of title 5, United States Code. To the extent that an allegation brought under this subsection involves section 2302(b)(8) of that title, a failure to obtain corrective action within 120 days after the date on which that allegation is received by the Integrity Committee shall, for purposes of section 1221 of such title, be considered to satisfy section 1214(a)(3)(B) of that title.

''(C) REGULATIONS.—The Integrity Committee may prescribe any rules or regulations necessary to carry out this paragraph, subject to such consultation or other requirements as might otherwise apply.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(b) of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–409; 122 Stat. 4312; 5 U.S.C. 1211 note) is repealed.

(b) AGENCY APPLICABILITY.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 3(a), is further amended—

(A) in section 8M—

(i) in subsection (a)(1)—

(I) by striking ''agency'' the first place it appears and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(II) by striking ''agency'' the second and third place it appears and inserting ''Federal agency or designated Federal entity''; and

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking ''agency'' and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(II) in paragraph (2)—

(aa) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''agency'' and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(bb) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''agency'' and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(B) in section 11(c)(3)(A)(ii), by striking ''department, agency, or entity of the executive branch'' and inserting ''Federal agency or designated Federal entity''.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head and the Inspector General of each Federal agency and each designated Federal entity (as such terms are defined in sections 12 and 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), respectively) shall implement the amendments made by this subsection.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL WEBSITES.—Section 8M(b)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''report or audit (or portion of any report or audit)'' and inserting ''audit report, inspection report, or evaluation report (or portion of any such report)''; and

(2) by striking ''report or audit (or portion of that report or audit)'' and inserting ''report (or portion of that report)'', each place it appears.

(d) CORRECTIONS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE ORDER NUMBER.—Section 7(c)(2) of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–409; 122 Stat. 4313; 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''12933'' and inserting ''12993''.

(2) PUNCTUATION AND CROSS-REFERENCES.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 3(a) and subsection (b), is further amended—

(A) in section 4(b)(2)—

(i) by striking ''8F(a)(2)'' and inserting ''8G(a)(2)'', each place it appears; and

(ii) by striking ''8F(a)(1)'' and inserting ''8G(a)(1)'';

(B) in section 6(a)(4), by striking ''information, as well as any tangible thing)'' and inserting ''information), as well as any tangible thing'';

(C) in section 8G(g)(3), by striking ''8C'' and inserting ''8D''; and

(D) in section 5(a)(13), by striking ''05(b)'' and inserting ''804(b)''.

(3) SPELLING.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 3(a), subsection (b), and paragraph (2), is further amended—

(A) in section 3(a), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena'';

(B) in section 6(a)(4), by striking ''subpena'' and ''subpenas'' and inserting ''subpoena'' and ''subpoenas'', respectively;

(C) in section 8D(a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subpenas'' and inserting ''subpoenas''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena'', each place it appears;

(D) in section 8E(a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subpenas'' and inserting ''subpoenas''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena'', each place it appears; and

(E) in section 8G(d), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena''.

(e) REPEAL.—Section 744 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (division D of Public Law 111–8; 123 Stat. 693) is repealed.

SEC. 6. REPORTS REQUIRED.

(a) REPORT ON VACANCIES IN THE OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) GAO STUDY REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of prolonged vacancies in the Offices of Inspector General, during which a temporary appointee has served as the head of the office that includes—

(A) the number and duration of Inspector General vacancies;

(B) an examination of the extent to which the number and duration of such vacancies has changed over time;

(C) an evaluation of the impact such vacancies have had on the ability of the relevant Office of the Inspector General to effectively carry out statutory requirements; and

(D) recommendations to minimize the duration of such vacancies.

(2) COMMITTEE BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall present a briefing on the findings of the study described in subsection (a) to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than fifteen months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the findings of the study described in subsection (a) to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(b) REPORT ON ISSUES INVOLVING MULTIPLE OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) EXAMINATION REQUIRED.—The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency shall conduct an analysis of critical issues that involve the jurisdiction of more than one individual Federal agency or entity to identify—

(A) each such issue that could be better addressed through greater coordination among, and cooperation between, individual Offices of Inspector General;

(B) the best practices that can be employed by the Offices of Inspector General to increase coordination and cooperation on each issue identified; and

(C) any recommended statutory changes that would facilitate coordination and cooperation among Offices of Inspector General on critical issues.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency shall submit

a report on the findings of the analysis described in subsection (a) to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 7. PUBLIC RELEASE OF MISCONDUCT REPORT.

(a) PUBLIC RELEASE BY INSPECTORS GENERAL OF REPORT OF MISCONDUCT.—Section 4(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) to make publicly available a final report on any administrative investigation that confirms misconduct, including any violation of Federal law and any significant violation of Federal agency policy, by any senior Government employee (as such term is defined under section 5(f)), not later than 60 days after issuance of the final report, ensuring that information protected under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), and section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.''.

(b) REPORTS OF MISCONDUCT IN SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(a)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(18) statistical tables showing—

''(A) the total number of investigative reports issued during that reporting period;

''(B) the total number of persons referred to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution during that reporting period;

''(C) the total number of persons referred to State and local prosecutive authorities for criminal prosecution during that reporting period; and

''(D) the total number of indictments and criminal informations during that reporting period that have resulted from any prior referral to prosecutive authorities;

''(19) a description of the metrics used for developing the data for the statistical tables under paragraph (18);

''(20) detailed descriptions of each investigation conducted by the Office involving a senior Government employee where allegations of misconduct were substantiated, including a detailed description of—

''(A) the facts and circumstances of the investigation; and

''(B) the status and disposition of the matter, including—

''(i) if the matter was referred to the Department of Justice, the date of the referral; and

''(ii) if the Department of Justice declined the referral, the date of the declination; and

''(21) a list and summary of the particular circumstances of each—

''(A) inspection, evaluation, and audit conducted by the Office that is closed and was not disclosed to the public; and

''(B) investigation conducted by the Office that is closed and was not disclosed to the public involving a senior Government employee.''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) the term 'senior Government employee' means—

''(A) an officer or employee in the executive branch (including a special Government employee as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code) who occupies a position classified at or above GS–15 of the General Schedule or, in the case of positions not under the General Schedule, for which the rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than 120 percent of the minimum rate of basic pay payable for GS–15 of the General Schedule; and

''(B) any commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 and above.''.

SEC. 8. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2395, the Inspector General Empowerment Act.

Indeed, the inspectors general play a key role in improving our government's efficiency. They conduct investigations and audits to prevent and detect waste, fraud, and mismanagement in their agencies' programs. The IGs help Congress to shape legislation and to target our oversight and investigative activities.

The IGs have proven to be one of Congress' best investments. In the last fiscal year, the IG community used their $2.6 billion budget to identify potential cost savings to the taxpayers, totaling $46.5 billion. That means that for every dollar in the total IG's budget, they identified approximately $18 in savings.

In light of this return on investment, we want the IGs to have every access to the records that they need to do their jobs. But that hasn't always been the case, Mr. Speaker. For example, at the Justice Department, the inspector general could not access grand jury documents or national security-related documents without the approval of the Deputy Attorney General or the Federal courts.

At the EPA, several offices, including the EPA's Office of Homeland Security, intentionally interfered with the IG's investigations. At the Chemical Safety Board—which the EPA OIG also oversees—the IG was denied access to certain documents based on a phony attorney-client privilege claim. And the Peace Corps refused to provide its inspector general access to information related to sexual assaults on the Peace Corps volunteers absent a memorandum of understanding.

In all of these instances, the agencies had clear guidance from section 6(a) of the IG Act to provide the IG with access to all records, but that guidance, indeed, was ignored.

The IG Empowerment Act makes clear that section 6(a) means exactly what it says: Every inspector general shall have access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other materials.

When agencies refuse or limit IGs' access to agency records, it undermines the intent of Congress and frustrates our mutual interest in government transparency and efficiency. Furthermore, the negotiations between agencies and their IGs are wasteful. Both sides commit time and resources—which sometimes include hiring outside lawyers—so that those resources could be better used elsewhere.

These are some of the problems that we are trying to address with the Inspector General Empowerment Act. The bill we are considering today will make the IGs even more effective by allowing them to follow the facts where they lead. For years, the IGs have asked us to extend to them the authority to issue subpoenas to get answers from government contractors and former Federal employees.

Independent sources, including the DOJ's National Procurement Task Force and the Project on Government Oversight, have also urged Congress to expand the testimonial subpoena authority.

This bill provides the expanded authority that the IGs have asked for, but with safeguards in place to make sure that they protect against the possibility that an IG's investigation would interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation, or do other harm.

This bill represents several years of bipartisan work, and it reflects input from stakeholders. I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2395, the Inspector General Empowerment Act. This bill, introduced by Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman JASON CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, was approved by the committee with strong bipartisan support.

There is a reason why this bill has so much support: it strengthens the inspectors general, who are the first line

of defense against waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programs. In fiscal year 2014 alone, IGs made recommendations to improve the economy and efficiency of Federal programs that could save $46.5 billion. As my colleague, Mr. MEADOWS, stated, this is a return of about $18 for every $1 invested in IG budgets.

The bill would make a number of improvements to the Inspector General Act. It will guarantee IG access to agency information. Unfettered access to agency information is a cornerstone of the IG's ability to conduct their missions effectively. The bill would also grant IGs the authority to issue subpoenas to compel testimony after careful review and with the concurrence of the Department of Justice. IGs would also be granted expedited authority to match Federal records across agencies under this bill, which would facilitate audits and help identify fraud and waste in Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the Inspector General Empowerment Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for his vision and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for working in a bipartisan way to not only empower our IGs, but give them the tools necessary to do what they do best; that is, to work on behalf of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to let Congresswoman LAWRENCE know that I have no further speakers at this point and am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I, again, give my support to this bill. I want to note that this is bipartisan. So often we have many disagreements on either side of the aisle about policy. It is a good day in Congress when we work together in a bipartisan way to empower our Federal agencies while saving money and creating efficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), my good friend. She well notes that not only is this a bipartisan bill, but it is one that is widely supported. I would also like to thank our respective staffs for the hard work that they have put in on crafting this particular piece of legislation. I think it becomes a powerful tool.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Inspector General Empowerment Act.

Inspectors General play a crucial role in making the federal government more effective and efficient. The bill we are considering today will help the IGs do their jobs even better. I appreciate the time and effort that Oversight Committee Chairman JASON CHAFFETZ and his staff put into making this bill a truly bipartisan product. I also want to thank Representative MARK MEADOWS for his work on this bill.

This bill would make crystal clear that Inspectors General have the right to access any information available to the agency the IG oversees. An agency could not deny an IG access to information unless Congress expressly limits the rights of an IG to access the information in a statute.

The bill includes special provisions for grand jury information held by the Department of Justice. Under the bill, the IG for DOJ would have unfettered access to grand jury information, but the Attorney General could limit access to grand jury information for other agency IGs under certain exceptions. This language was painstakingly worked out with feedback from DOJ and the Inspectors General.

The Inspector General Empowerment Act would also give Inspectors General the ability to subpoena witnesses. This would be a significant new authority.

I believe most IGs would act responsibly and use this authority only when absolutely necessary. There is a potential for abuse, however, so the bill includes several safeguards. The bill would require an IG, before issuing a subpoena, to go through two reviews.

The first review would be conducted by the Council of Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency. A panel of three Inspectors General would approve or deny any request by an IG to issue a subpoena for witness testimony. The second review would be conducted by the Attorney General, who would have the opportunity to object if the subpoena would interfere with an ongoing investigation. I believe the bill strikes a careful balance in granting IGs the authority to interview witnesses outside of the government while also providing these important checks against potential abuse.

The Inspector General Empowerment Act would also make needed reforms to the process used for investigating allegations of wrongdoing by Inspectors General. The current process can be agonizingly slow. The bill also contains several other reforms aimed at helping IGs perform independent audits and investigations.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2395, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEMALE VETERAN SUICIDE PREVENTION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2487) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2487

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Female Veteran Suicide Prevention Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIFIC CONSIDERATION OF WOMEN VETERANS IN EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

Section 1709B(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including metrics applicable specifically to women'';

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) identify the mental health care and suicide prevention programs conducted by the Secretary that are most effective for women veterans and such programs with the highest satisfaction rates among women veterans.''.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

FISCAL YEAR 2016 DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS SEISMIC SAFETY AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4590) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations are being made for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety and Construction Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects, with each project to be carried out in an amount not to exceed the amount specified for that project:

(1) Seismic corrections to buildings, including retrofitting and replacement of high-risk buildings, in San Francisco, California, in an amount not to exceed $175,880,000.

(2) Seismic corrections to facilities, including facilities to support homeless veterans,

at the medical center in West Los Angeles, California, in an amount not to exceed $100,250,000.

(3) Seismic corrections to the mental health and community living center in Long Beach, California, in an amount not to exceed $282,100,000.

(4) Construction of an outpatient clinic, administrative space, cemetery, and columbarium in Alameda, California, in an amount not to exceed $83,782,000.

(5) Realignment of medical facilities in Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed $188,650,000.

(6) Construction of a replacement community living center in Perry Point, Maryland, in an amount not to exceed $92,700,000.

(7) Seismic corrections and other renovations to several buildings and construction of a specialty care building in American Lake, Washington, in an amount not to exceed $13,830,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2016 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Construction, Major Projects, account, $937,192,000 for the projects authorized in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—The projects authorized in subsection (a) may only be carried out using—

(1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 2016 pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b);

(2) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016 that remain available for obligation;

(3) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 that remain available for obligation;

(4) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for fiscal year 2016 for a category of activity not specific to a project;

(5) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016 for a category of activity not specific to a project; and

(6) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 for a category of activity not specific to a project.

SEC. 3. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, for each project authorized in section 2(a), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate the following information:

(1) A line item accounting of expenditures relating to construction management carried out by the Department of Veterans Affairs for such project.

(2) The future amounts that are budgeted to be obligated for construction management carried out by the Department for such project.

(3) A justification for the expenditures described in paragraph (1) and the future amounts described in paragraph (2).

(4) Any agreement entered into by the Secretary regarding the Army Corps of Engineers providing services relating to such project, including reimbursement agreements and the costs to the Department of Veterans Affairs for such services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4590, as amended, the Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety and Construction Authorization Act.

This bill, which I have sponsored, would authorize seven major medical facility projects in San Francisco, California; West Los Angeles, California; Long Beach, California; Alameda, California; Livermore, California; Perry Point, Maryland; and American Lake, Washington.

These projects will correct seismic safety issues in high-risk VA medical facilities, provide housing and support services for homeless veterans, increase the availability of outpatient care, and replace outdated buildings with modern ones that are better suited to providing the high-quality care that our veterans deserve. Each of these projects was requested in the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2016, and funds have already been appropriated for them.

Many in this Chamber are well aware of the debacle that characterized VA's management of the Denver replacement hospital facility construction project. Cost overruns and extensive delays had become the status quo for mostly all VA major construction projects. In the case of Denver, the price tag more than doubled from the initial estimate. As a result of that, for all projects costing over $100 million going forward, we now call them ''super construction'' projects. A non-VA entity will assume project management responsibilities.

Of the seven projects to be authorized in this bill, six of them meet the super construction criteria. The Army Corps of Engineers will be managing those six projects. In light of that, I have reduced the total authorization for these projects slightly, since VA should no longer require funds that have been built into the projects for VA construction management.

With little transparency into what is actually required for VA to manage these projects supposedly in support of the Army Corps of Engineers, I hesitate to authorize any additional management funding without a full accounting of what is essential to completely execute these projects. This bill would require that VA would provide a full accounting of management expenditures for these projects, going forward.

Mr. Speaker, before we conclude debate on the VA construction bill, I feel obliged to discuss the absence of one particular project—the new replacement medical facility in Louisville, Kentucky.

First, the proposed construction project in Louisville has been criticized by local stakeholders who have expressed concerns regarding the parcel of land that VA has proposed constructing this new facility on. Those concerns were validated by the committee following an on-site investigation last year, and, as a result, VA has initiated an environmental impact study that is ongoing today. The EIS will take a year or more to complete and could very well result in a determination that VA pursue a different approach to ensuring that Louisville area veterans are provided the high-quality care they earned and deserve.

Given that, I believe it would be untimely and inappropriate for Congress to authorize this project before the EIS is complete. That conclusion is shared by VA construction officials, who stated themselves, in a briefing with committee staff earlier this year, that it would be premature to authorize the Louisville project at this time since the EIS is in progress and the way ahead for the project is uncertain.

Finally, VA has a disastrous history of building VA hospitals on time and on budget. The Denver construction project is $1 billion—$1 billion—over budget.

After opening the new Orlando hospital years late and hundreds of millions over budget, VA quietly settled with the Orlando hospital contractor for an additional $213 million over the budget. And the New Orleans hospital is $100 million over budget right now. In light of this track record, the strictest of scrutiny needs to be applied to major hospital projects going forward, and that must begin with Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) control the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4590, the Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety and Construction Authorization Act.

The major duty of this committee is to make sure that our veterans have access to the best care they can receive, and authorizing construction or ensuring that existing facilities are structurally sound is very important.

All the facilities included in this bill—San Francisco, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Alameda, Livermore in California; Perry Point, Maryland; and American Lake, Washington—are all in need of major renovations to make them safe.

I am glad we are passing this bill today, and I look forward to breaking ground on these projects sooner rather

than later. I urge all Members to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 4590, a bill to authorize funding for numerous Department of Veterans Affairs construction projects throughout the Nation.

Funding for many of these projects was already appropriated in fiscal year 2016 but needs authorization, and this is what the bill does.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member BROWN for their work and commitment to our Nation's veterans and for bringing this bill to the floor.

The VA is currently challenged by a growing backlog in construction projects and old infrastructure. The VA manages over 6,000 buildings and nearly 34,000 acres of land. Additionally, more than 4,000 critical infrastructure gaps remain, which are estimated to cost between $56 billion and $68 billion to close. A growing backlog in construction projects and infrastructure is leading veterans to have to wait too long to receive the care they need and deserve.

This list of construction projects is also one of the reasons I have introduced H.R. 4129, the Jumpstart VA Construction Act. This bill provides for public-private partnerships at the VA to expedite construction opportunities at the VA. H.R. 4129 will help maximize partnerships between Federal and non-Federal entities and ensure that we avoid the systemic problems that have plagued the VA in the past, projects like Denver and Orlando.

Meanwhile, H.R. 4590 also includes funding for the Livermore realignment project, as was mentioned by the chairman and ranking member. This is a project that is very important to the veterans of the Central Valley of California, including my district.

This funding would provide for the construction of a 158,000-square-foot community-based outpatient clinic in French Camp, California. While vets have been waiting for years, I fought for this project for at least 8 years. The French Camp community-based outpatient clinic will serve 87,000 veterans across a wide geographic area that includes San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Alameda Counties, among others. California's Central Valley veterans confront many obstacles accessing the care they need from the VA.

I want to tell you a little story. In Stockton, California, it is about a 3-hour commute to the nearest VA center, which is in Palo Alto. The commute takes long because it is a distance and because there is tremendous traffic. I took the ride along with one of our veterans a couple of years ago, and it took all day to go in for a half-hour appointment.

Now, not every elderly gentleman can sit in a car for 3 hours one way and then 3 hours back. This is a real hardship. Not only can they not sit in a car for that long, but they may not even have that kind of transportation. So this is very important. I am sure that all of these projects have that kind of a story.

We need more facilities. We need this authorization. Congress approved the Central Valley community-based outpatient clinic and community center in 2004 as part of the VA's Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services initiatives. In 2010, Congress appropriated $55 million for land acquisition and to fund construction and planning. The project is ready to begin construction, and our Central Valley veterans are eager to see progress on a project that was promised to them in 2004.

The French Camp outpatient clinic would offer an array of services: primary care, mental health care, radiology, audiology, physical and occupational therapy, dental, and other specialty services throughout the telehealth system.

Veterans have sacrificed so much to protect our freedom and democracy. They deserve access to state-of-the-art healthcare facilities closer to home. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4590.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4590.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MILLER, Ms. BROWN, and Mr. MCNERNEY for their work on this bill.

I encourage all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4590, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABIE ABRAHAM VA CLINIC

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5317) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic'', as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Abie Abraham of Lyndora, Pennsylvania, was stationed during World War II with the 18th Infantry in New York; three years with the 14th Infantry in Panama; 15th Infantry, unassigned in China, while the U.S.S. Panay was sunk; 30th Infantry, Presidio, San Francisco; and the 31st Infantry, Manila, Philippines, for nine years.

(2) During World War II, Abraham fought, was captured, endured the Bataan Death March and as a prisoner of war for three and a half years, was beaten, stabbed, shot, survived malaria and starvation to be rescued by the 6th Rangers.

(3) Abraham stayed behind at the request of General Douglas MacArthur for two and a half more years disinterring the bodies of his fallen comrades from the Bataan Death March and the prison camps, helping to identify their bodies and see that they were properly laid to rest.

(4) After his promotion in 1945, Abraham came back to the United States where he served as a recruiter and then also served two years in Germany until his retirement with 30 years of service as a Master Sergeant.

(5) Abraham received numerous medals for his service, including the Purple Heart, and had several documentaries on the Discovery Channel and History Channel.

(6) Abraham wrote the books ''Ghost of Bataan Speaks'' in 1971 and ''Oh, God, Where Are You'' in 1977 to help the public better understand what our brave men endured at the hands of the Imperial Japanese Army as prisoners of war.

(7) Abraham was a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Purple Heart Combat/Infantry Organization, the American Ex-POWs, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Defenders of Bataan.

(8) Abraham was a volunteer at Veterans Affairs Butler Healthcare for 23 years from 1988 to 2011 and had 36,851 service hours caring for our veterans.

SEC. 2. ABIE ABRAHAM VA CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the health care center referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5317, a bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs VA healthcare center in Center Township,

Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the Abie Abraham VA Clinic.

This bill is sponsored by Congressman MIKE KELLY from Pennsylvania. I am grateful to him for his work to introduce this legislation to honor a true American hero.

Master Sergeant Abraham lived a truly remarkable life. Born in Lyndora, Pennsylvania, as 1 of 11 children, he set a world record as a young teenager for sitting in a tree for 3½ months—that is rather amazing, I might add—according to his obituary in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

In 1932, at the age of just 19, he enlisted in the United States Navy. Two years later, he enlisted in the United States Army. Over the course of a 30-year military career, he served in the Philippines, China, Germany, Panama, and earned a number of well-deserved accolades, including the Purple Heart.

During World War II, he survived the Bataan Death March. Over the course of 3½ years in captivity, Master Sergeant Abraham was beaten, stabbed, shot, and starved. At one point, he contracted malaria. Instead of returning immediately to the United States following his rescue, Master Sergeant Abraham agreed to stay behind at the request of General Douglas MacArthur. For 2½ years, he worked to recover the remains of his fallen comrades and to ensure they received the respect they were certainly due.

Following his service, Abie Abraham devoted his time to caring for his fellow brothers and sisters in arms. He was a lifelong member of several veterans service organizations. He also volunteered at the VA Butler Healthcare Center, where, over the course of 23 years, he would spend almost 40,000 hours tending to veteran patients there.

□ 1715

According to his obituary, Master Sergeant Abraham would arrive at the Butler VA facility at 6:45 in the morning, 5 days a week, and spend hours in greeting veteran patients, in helping them where they needed to go, in answering their questions, in bringing them coffee, and in generally making their experiences at the VA easier and better. In his spare time, he authored two books about his experiences in the military; he made public appearances at schools and community centers; and he participated in documentary films that have aired on the Discovery and History channels.

I must mention as well that, in addition to his being a hero on the battlefield and at the VA afterwards, an accomplished author, and an inspirational mentor, he was also a lightweight boxing champion and trainer.

In 2012, Master Sergeant Abraham died at the age of 98. Given his long and full life—a life that was characterized by service to others both in uniform and out—it is only fitting and appropriate that we honor Master Sergeant Abraham by naming the VA healthcare center in Butler County, Pennsylvania, after him.

This legislation satisfies all of the committee's naming criteria and is supported by the Pennsylvania congressional delegation as well as by many VSOs.

Once again, I thank my colleague, Congressman MIKE KELLY, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5317, a bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the Abie Abraham VA Clinic.

Born in 1913, Abie Abraham was a decorated World War II veteran who served in both the United States Navy and the United States Army and served in the Philippines, China, Germany, and Panama. As the text of the bill states, he was captured by the Japanese in the Philippines and survived the Bataan Death March and 3½ years as a prisoner of war. Not only did he survive that ordeal, but when General MacArthur asked him to stay and help identify the remains of his fallen comrades, he did so for almost 3 more years, making sure those who died in the Philippines received proper military funerals.

He wrote his first book, ''Ghost of Bataan Speaks,'' in 1971 and wrote his second book, ''Oh, God. Where Are You?'' in 1997. His intent was to help the public better understand what took place with regard to our brave men being POWs at the hands of the Japanese.

Abie Abraham had received numerous medals for his service, including the Purple Heart. He was a life member of the VFW, the American Legion, the Purple Heart Combat/Infantry organization, the Ex-Prisoners of War organization, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Defenders of Bataan. He had been a volunteer at the VA Butler Healthcare Center since 1988 and had volunteered over 38,000 hours. One of his favorite pastimes was helping other veterans.

For all that Mr. Abraham did during and after the war, I rise in support of this legislation to name this VA facility after him—a true American.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 5317. This is the designation of the Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the Abie Abraham VA Clinic, as amended, and I urge its adoption.

I never called him ''Abie.'' I always called him ''Sergeant'' or ''Mr. Abraham.'' I knew him, and he was not a very big man. If you were to see him, his stature, he was, probably, 5 feet, 5 inches or 5 feet, 6 inches. When I met him, it was a little bit later in life, and he never, ever bragged about his service. He never talked about it. I just knew him as a guy who lived in my hometown, as a guy who was a veteran, as a guy who was a prisoner of war; but then things started to unfold about what Mr. Abraham had endured. Now, I want you to think about this.

Once the Japanese attacked the Philippines and were able to take the peninsula at Bataan, Mr. Abraham survived the Bataan Death March. That was 6 days and 7 nights of endless marching without food, without water, without any type of medical care. He had been 3½ years interned in a Japanese prison camp. You heard what the doctor said and what Ms. BROWN said. This guy went through incredible pain and suffering to get there, but for as long as I knew him, he never bragged about it. He never said, ''This is what I did.'' I never knew until he wrote the book about the ghost of Bataan.

I sat down with him one night, and I said: Mr. Abraham, you never told me about this.

He said: Well, you didn't need to know about this. It is just something we all did.

Every American came forward and did what he could do during World War II and continued to do it. There are 1.4 million Americans in uniform who have given their lives so that this county could survive, so that our country could survive.

If you knew Abie Abraham the way I knew Abie Abraham and the way the people in my town knew Abie Abraham, he was totally selfless. His whole mission in life was to serve veterans. In 1988, he visited somebody in the VA hospital, and he decided, after that, to stay. He stayed and he stayed and he stayed—almost 37,000 hours of volunteer service.

When you look at his gravestone—and I was there when he was interred in Arlington—it reads: ''Born July 31, 1913. Died March 22, 2011.'' Yet they don't talk about the days in between. They don't talk about the minutes in between or about the hours in between or about the years in between—those 98 years he spent in service and, especially, the last years of his life.

If you were to have gone to the VA center in Butler, you would have seen he was there every morning at a quarter to 7. He was there to help people—to greet veterans, to let them know that they were appreciated. He used to tell people all the time, especially young people: When you meet a veteran, grab his or her hand and thank him for his service to America.

This is the type of America that I grew up in. I don't think it was unlike any other towns in America, and I don't think Mr. Abraham was different than any other citizen of America. They were just those types of people.

So now, for that veteran center to be named after Sergeant Abraham, I can't tell you the sense of pride it brings not only to the Abraham family and to my community in Butler, Pennsylvania, but to all of us, and to know that there are people out there who were willing to do these things, who were willing to sacrifice themselves. After being rescued—12,000 Americans were captured; he was 1 of 513 who survived. There were 12,000 who were captured, and 513 survived. The loss of life, the loss of future, the loss of enjoying a family—everything that life has to offer was taken from those people.

General MacArthur asked him: Abie, would you please stay and find those remains and dig them up so that you can bring some peace and comfort to those who died? Mrs. Abraham said Mr. Abraham would pray every night that the Lord would give him the strength to go out the next day because it was so horrible. He was digging up the remains, not of some people he didn't know, but of people who had actually been captured, of people he had marched with, of people he had tried to help get through this horrible time who had passed. His whole purpose in life was to bring peace to families, to bring peace to veterans, and to let them know how much he cared for them.

As a grateful country, we now have the opportunity to name a healthcare center after Sergeant Abie Abraham. He is truly somebody who befits the often said statement that there is only one office higher in our country than President, and that is that of patriot—not Republican, not Democrat, not Libertarian—patriot, American patriot. He was a man who loved peace and deplored the horrors of war but who never, ever tired in his service to his fellow servicemen, and he never, ever gave up. I can tell you, to his last day, Mr. Abraham thought about one thing every day, and that was about our men and women in uniform who gave their lives that this country—our country—could survive.

Do you know what? I know Mr. Abraham is looking down right now, and he is so happy that this facility is being named after him so that, for all time, he will be remembered.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5317.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a fellow veteran, I can't think of anything that I would rather be doing this afternoon than naming this VA center for this incredible American hero. Once again, I encourage all of the Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5317, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERAN ENGAGEMENT TEAMS ACT

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3936) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary carries out Veteran Engagement Team events where veterans can complete claims for disability compensation and pension under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3936

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veteran Engagement Teams Act'' or ''VET Act''.

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERAN ENGAGEMENT TEAM EVENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM.—Beginning not later than October 1, 2016, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a three-year pilot program under which the Secretary shall carry out events, to be known as ''Veteran Engagement Team events''. The Secretary shall ensure that such events are carried out—

(A) during the first year during which the Secretary carries out the pilot program, at least once a month in a location within the jurisdiction of each of 10 regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including at least two regional offices in each of the five districts of the Veterans Benefits Administration under the organization of such Administration in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) during each of the second and third years during which the Secretary carries out the pilot program, at least once a month in a location within the jurisdiction of each of 15 regional offices of the Department, including at least three regional offices in each such district.

(2) VETERAN ENGAGEMENT TEAM EVENTS.—During each Veteran Engagement Team event, the Secretary shall provide assistance to veterans in completing and adjudicating claims for disability compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, and for pension under chapter 15 of such title. The Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) all Veteran Engagement Team events occur during the normal business hours of the sponsoring regional office;

(B) the events are carried out at different locations within the jurisdiction of each regional office and at least 50 miles from any regional office;

(C) a sufficient number of physicians (to be available for opinions only), veteran service representatives and rating veteran service representatives, and other personnel are available at the events to initiate, update, and finalize the completion and adjudication of claims;

(D) veterans service organizations have access to the events for purposes of providing assistance to veterans; and

(E) a veteran who is unable to complete and adjudicate a claim at an event is informed of what additional information or actions are needed to finalize the claim.

(b) LOCATION.—In selecting locations for Veteran Engagement Team events under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) coordinate with veteran service organizations and State and local veterans agencies; and

(2) seek to select locations that are community-based and easily accessible.

(c) TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL.—

(1) PHYSICIANS.—The Secretary may not permanently transfer any physician employed by the Veterans Health Administration for the purpose of staffing a Veteran Engagement Team event.

(2) PAYMENT OF SALARIES.—Any amount payable to an employee of the Department for work performed at a Veteran Engagement Team event is payable only from amounts otherwise available for the payment of the salary of the employee. No additional amounts are authorized to be appropriated under this section for the payment of salaries for Department employee.

(d) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary may—

(1) coordinate with States, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private sector entities to use facilities to host Veteran Engagement Team events for no or minimal costs; and

(2) accept, on a without compensation basis, services provided by non-Department physicians in rendering medical opinions relating to claims for compensation and pension.

(e) CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEYS.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall collect and analyze information about the customer satisfaction of veterans who have received assistance at an Veteran Engagement Team event.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than April 30, 2017, and annually thereafter beginning on October 1, 2017, for the duration of the program, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation and effectiveness of the events. Such report shall include—

(1) the number and types of claims completed and adjudicated at the events;

(2) the number and types of claims for which assistance was sought at the events that were not completed or adjudicated at the events and the reasons such claims were not completed or adjudicated; and

(3) an analysis of the customer satisfaction of veterans who have received assistance at an event based on the information collected under subsection (e).

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION TO LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES.

Section 705 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 703 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 705. LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

''The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the aggregate amount of awards and bonuses paid by the Secretary in a fiscal year under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title or title 38, United States Code, does not exceed the following amounts:

''(1) With respect to fiscal year 2017, $250,000,000.

''(2) With respect to each of fiscal years 2018 through 2024, $360,000,000.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on H.R. 3936, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise and urge all Members to support H.R. 3936, as amended. H.R. 3936 would authorize a 3-year pilot program for Veteran Engagement Teams.

Veteran Engagement Teams allow the Department of Veterans Affairs' employees to meet one on one with veterans to help facilitate the claims process. Veteran Engagement Teams bring veterans and VA claims processors and physicians to help facilitate the claims process. The VA is currently testing a similar program that has proven to be both popular and successful. Allowing veterans to talk with VA employees face-to-face helps to reduce confusion and frustration with the VA's complicated claims process.

H.R. 3936, as amended, would require the VA to continue to provide this personal service to many veterans, which would reduce their frustration and confusion with the VA's complicated claims process.

I thank Mr. COSTELLO, a member of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, for introducing this bill and for being an advocate for our veterans and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3936, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of Mr. COSTELLO's bill, H.R. 3936, that would establish a 3-year pilot program to assist veterans in receiving timely decisions on their claims.

Under this administration, the VA has nearly eliminated the claims backlog. At the height of the backlog in 2013, there were more than 600,000 claims. Today, that number has been reduced to fewer than 75,000. The VA has made incredible strides on claims, and I applaud its hardworking staff who has made this happen. However, we also owe it to our veterans to look at and test new methods to improve services and continue refining the VA claims process. This legislation is a step in that direction.

However, I must note that the VA's success in the timely processing of claims has come at the cost of a new backlog—appeals. There is an appeals inventory of 450,000. The average wait for a veteran to have his appeal resolved is almost 5 years.

□ 1730

We need to address this in our closing legislative days. If we do not act now, the VA predicts veterans will have to wait 10 years for a decision on their appeal. Now, I know we all agree that that simply is unacceptable. I look forward to working in a bipartisan fashion to fix this issue immediately.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), my friend and fellow member of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support my legislation, H.R. 3936, the VET Act, also known as the Veteran Engagement Teams Act.

I would first like to thank Congressman MIKE FITZPATRICK from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, and our staffers—Congressman FITZPATRICK's staffer Justin Rusk, and my senior legislative aide, Katharine Bruce—for all their hard work on the VET Act. I am proud to have introduced this legislation with them, and we would not be here today were it not for their important collaboration in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the VET Act is a solution for the veteran who needs assistance navigating the Department of Veterans Affairs claims process. Many veterans struggle to navigate the VA's bureaucracy to submit their disability compensation or pension claims and to receive the benefits that they have earned.

The VET Act aims to solve this problem and, in the process, reduce wait times, possible miscommunications, and lost paperwork by taking VA employees out of the office and placing them in the community where they can provide area veterans with one-on-one assistance at Veteran Engagement Team events. The events would be carried out at least 50 miles from any regional office, and the Secretary would ensure that a sufficient number of physicians, veterans service representatives, and other personnel are present to initiate, update and finalize the completion and adjudication of claims. Pro bono services can also be provided at these events to help offer assistance to veterans from veteran service organizations. And the VA is instructed to coordinate with States, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private-sector entities to secure community facilities at little or no cost, creating a so-called one-stop shop for veterans.

And this is the gist of the bill, Mr. Speaker: if a veteran is unable to complete their claim at a VET event, the legislation directs VA employees to provide clear next steps for the veteran. Many veterans express frustration about the lack of clarity from the VA, and subsequently we find ourselves, as the ranking member mentioned, with a claims backlog often due to remands. And veterans get bounced back and forth, perhaps not even knowing that they did not submit information that they have in their records but have not yet been told by the VA. This aims to eliminate that.

That is why under this legislation VA staff would be required to file reports that explain why claims were not completed, the number and types of claims that were completed, and customer satisfaction. Each of these steps is part of the solution to perfecting a claim, expediting its review, and avoiding unnecessary remands which clog up the claims docket. The goal is a more efficient system, Mr. Speaker. Transparency, timeliness, and accountability are the guiding principles of this bill.

The VET Act's method is already assisting veterans. American Legion Veterans Benefits Centers and regional VA claims clinics have tested VET events and found success, proving this legislation can restore trust between veterans and the VA.

It is also important to note the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Paralyzed Veterans of America have all voiced their support for this bill.

With over 45,000 veterans in my district, nearly 1 million in Pennsylvania and almost 22 million veterans in the United States, this legislation is a forward-looking solution that has the potential to assist many veterans across our country. Our veterans have earned their benefits, and this bill aims to make it easier for vets to file their claim and receive their benefits.

Finally, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, the ranking member, and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee staff for their support and assistance and for ensuring this bill moved through the House this session.

Our veterans have waited long enough and House passage today puts us one step closer to this bill becoming law. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3936, the VET Act.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3936.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member BROWN, and the members of the committee for all these bills we have passed this afternoon.

I encourage all Members to support H.R. 3936, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3936, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS TO PAY FOR RESULTS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5170) to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act''.

SEC. 2. SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS TO PAY FOR RESULTS ACT.

Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SOCIAL IMPACT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

''(1) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subsection are the following:

''(A) To improve the lives of families and individuals in need in the United States by funding social programs that achieve real results.

''(B) To redirect funds away from programs that, based on objective data, are ineffective, and into programs that achieve demonstrable, measurable results.

''(C) To ensure Federal funds are used effectively on social services to produce positive outcomes for both service recipients and taxpayers.

''(D) To establish the use of social impact partnerships to address some of our Nation's most pressing problems.

''(E) To facilitate the creation of public-private partnerships that bundle philanthropic or other private resources with existing public spending to scale up effective social interventions already being implemented by private organizations, nonprofits, charitable organizations, and State and local governments across the country.

''(F) To bring pay-for-performance to the social sector, allowing the United States to improve the impact and effectiveness of vital social services programs while redirecting inefficient or duplicative spending.

''(G) To incorporate outcomes measurement and randomized controlled trials or other rigorous methodologies for assessing program impact.

''(2) SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP APPLICATION.—

''(A) NOTICE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, shall publish in the Federal Register a request for proposals from States or local government for social impact partnership projects in accordance with this paragraph.

''(B) REQUIRED OUTCOMES FOR SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP PROJECT.—To qualify as a social impact partnership project under this subsection, a project must produce 1 or more measurable, clearly defined outcomes that result in social benefit and Federal savings through any of the following:

''(i) Increasing work and earnings by individuals who have been unemployed in the United States for more than 6 consecutive months.

''(ii) Increasing employment and earnings of individuals who have attained 16 years of age but not 25 years of age.

''(iii) Increasing employment among individuals receiving Federal disability benefits.

''(iv) Reducing the dependence of low-income families on Federal means-tested benefits.

''(v) Improving rates of high school graduation.

''(vi) Reducing teen and unplanned pregnancies.

''(vii) Improving birth outcomes and early childhood health and development among low-income families and individuals.

''(viii) Reducing rates of asthma, diabetes, or other preventable diseases among low-income families and individuals to reduce the utilization of emergency and other high-cost care.

''(ix) Increasing the proportion of children living in 2-parent families.

''(x) Reducing incidences and adverse consequences of child abuse and neglect.

''(xi) Reducing the number of youth in foster care by increasing adoptions, permanent guardianship arrangements, reunification, or placement with a fit and willing relative, or by avoiding placing children in foster care by ensuring they can be cared for safely in their own homes.

''(xii) Reducing the number of children and youth in foster care residing in group homes, child care institutions, agency-operated foster homes, or other non-family foster homes, unless it is determined that it is in the interest of the child's long-term health, safety, or psychological well-being to not be placed in a family foster home.

''(xiii) Reducing the number of children returning to foster care.

''(xiv) Reducing recidivism among juveniles, individuals released from prison, or other high-risk populations.

''(xv) Reducing the rate of homelessness among our most vulnerable populations.

''(xvi) Improving the health and well-being of those with mental, emotional, and behavioral health needs.

''(xvii) Improving the educational outcomes of special-needs or low-income children.

''(xviii) Improving the employment and well-being of returning United States military members.

''(xix) Increasing the financial stability of low-income families.

''(xx) Increasing the independence and employability of individuals who are physically or mentally disabled.

''(xxi) Other measurable outcomes defined by the State or local government that result in positive social outcomes and Federal savings.

''(C) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—The notice described in subparagraph (A) shall require a State or local government to submit an application for the social impact partnership project that addresses the following:

''(i) The outcome goals of the project.

''(ii) A description of each intervention in the project and anticipated outcomes of the intervention.

''(iii) Rigorous evidence demonstrating that the intervention can be expected to produce the desired outcomes.

''(iv) The target population that will be served by the project.

''(v) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(vi) Projected Federal, State, and local government costs and other costs to conduct the project.

''(vii) Projected Federal, State, and local government savings and other savings, including an estimate of the savings to the Federal Government, on a program-by-program basis and in the aggregate, if the project is implemented and the outcomes are achieved.

''(viii) If savings resulting from the successful completion of the project are estimated to accrue to the State or local government, the likelihood of the State or local government to realize those savings.

''(ix) A plan for delivering the intervention through a social impact partnership model.

''(x) A description of the expertise of each service provider that will administer the intervention, including a summary of the experience of the service provider in delivering the proposed intervention or a similar intervention, or demonstrating that the service provider has the expertise necessary to deliver the proposed intervention.

''(xi) An explanation of the experience of the State or local government, the intermediary, or the service provider in raising private and philanthropic capital to fund social service investments.

''(xii) The detailed roles and responsibilities of each entity involved in the project, including any State or local government entity, intermediary, service provider, independent evaluator, investor, or other stakeholder.

''(xiii) A summary of the experience of the service provider delivering the proposed intervention or a similar intervention, or a summary demonstrating the service provider has the expertise necessary to deliver the proposed intervention.

''(xiv) A summary of the unmet need in the area where the intervention will be delivered or among the target population who will receive the intervention.

''(xv) The proposed payment terms, the methodology used to calculate outcome payments, the payment schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(xvi) The project budget.

''(xvii) The project timeline.

''(xviii) The criteria used to determine the eligibility of an individual for the project, including how selected populations will be identified, how they will be referred to the project, and how they will be enrolled in the project.

''(xix) The evaluation design.

''(xx) The metrics that will be used to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved and how the metrics will be measured.

''(xxi) An explanation of how the metrics used to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved are independent, objective indicators of impact and are not subject to manipulation by the service provider, intermediary, or investor.

''(xxii) A summary explaining the independence of the evaluator from the other entities involved in the project and the evaluator's experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of program effectiveness including, where available, well-implemented randomized controlled trials on the intervention or similar interventions.

''(xxiii) The capacity of the service provider to deliver the intervention to the number of participants the State or local government proposes to serve in the project.

''(D) PROJECT INTERMEDIARY INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The application described in subparagraph (C) shall also contain the following information about any intermediary for the social impact partnership project (whether an intermediary is a service provider or other entity):

''(i) Experience and capacity for providing or facilitating the provision of the type of intervention proposed.

''(ii) The mission and goals.

''(iii) Information on whether the intermediary is already working with service providers that provide this intervention or an

explanation of the capacity of the intermediary to begin working with service providers to provide the intervention.

''(iv) Experience working in a collaborative environment across government and nongovernmental entities.

''(v) Previous experience collaborating with public or private entities to implement evidence-based programs.

''(vi) Ability to raise or provide funding to cover operating costs (if applicable to the project).

''(vii) Capacity and infrastructure to track outcomes and measure results, including—

''(I) capacity to track and analyze program performance and assess program impact; and

''(II) experience with performance-based awards or performance-based contracting and achieving project milestones and targets.

''(viii) Role in delivering the intervention.

''(ix) How the intermediary would monitor program success, including a description of the interim benchmarks and outcome measures.

''(E) FEASIBILITY STUDIES FUNDED THROUGH OTHER SOURCES.—The notice described in subparagraph (A) shall permit a State or local government to submit an application for social impact partnership funding that contains information from a feasibility study developed for purposes other than applying for funding under this subsection.

''(3) AWARDING SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

''(A) TIMELINE IN AWARDING AGREEMENT.—Not later than 6 months after receiving an application in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, shall determine whether to enter into an agreement for a social impact partnership project with a State or local government.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS IN AWARDING AGREEMENT.—In determining whether to enter into an agreement for a social impact partnership project (the application for which was submitted under paragraph (2)) the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships (established by paragraph (6)) and the head of any Federal agency administering a similar intervention or serving a population similar to that served by the project, shall consider each of the following:

''(i) The recommendations made by the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(ii) The value to the Federal Government of the outcomes expected to be achieved if the outcomes specified in the agreement are achieved.

''(iii) The likelihood, based on evidence provided in the application and other evidence, that the State or local government in collaboration with the intermediary and the service providers will achieve the outcomes.

''(iv) The savings to the Federal Government if the outcomes specified in the agreement are achieved.

''(v) The savings to the State and local governments if the outcomes specified in the agreement are achieved.

''(vi) The expected quality of the evaluation that would be conducted with respect to the agreement.

''(C) AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—

''(i) AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—In accordance with this paragraph, the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships and the head of any Federal agency administering a similar intervention or serving a population similar to that served by the project, may enter into an agreement for a social impact partnership project with a State or local government if the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, determines that each of the following requirements are met:

''(I) The State or local government agrees to achieve 1 or more outcomes specified in the agreement in order to receive payment.

''(II) The Federal payment to the State or local government for each outcome specified is less than or equal to the value of the outcome to the Federal Government over a period not to exceed 10 years, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the State or local government.

''(III) The duration of the project does not exceed 10 years.

''(IV) The State or local government has demonstrated, through the application submitted under paragraph (2), that, based on prior rigorous experimental evaluations or rigorous quasi-experimental studies, the intervention can be expected to achieve each outcome specified in the agreement.

''(V) The State, local government, intermediary, or service provider has experience raising private or philanthropic capital to fund social service investments (if applicable to the project).

''(VI) The State or local government has shown that each service provider has experience delivering the intervention, a similar intervention, or has otherwise demonstrated the expertise necessary to deliver the intervention.

''(ii) PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall pay the State or local government only if the independent evaluator described in paragraph (5) determines that the social impact partnership project has met the requirements specified in the agreement and achieved an outcome specified in the agreement.

''(D) NOTICE OF AGREEMENT AWARD.—Not later than 30 days after entering into an agreement under this paragraph, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register that includes, with regard to the agreement, the following:

''(i) The outcome goals of the social impact partnership project.

''(ii) A description of each intervention in the project.

''(iii) The target population that will be served by the project.

''(iv) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(v) The detailed roles, responsibilities, and purposes of each Federal, State, or local government entity, intermediary, service provider, independent evaluator, investor, or other stakeholder.

''(vi) The payment terms, the methodology used to calculate outcome payments, the payment schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(vii) The project budget.

''(viii) The project timeline.

''(ix) The project eligibility criteria.

''(x) The evaluation design.

''(xi) The metrics that will be used to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved and how these metrics will be measured.

''(xii) The estimate of the savings to the Federal, State, and local government, on a program-by-program basis and in the aggregate, if the agreement is entered into and implemented and the outcomes are achieved.

''(E) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER ADMINISTRATION OF AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may transfer to the head of another Federal agency the authority to administer (including making payments under) an agreement entered into under subparagraph (C), and any funds necessary to do so.

''(F) REQUIREMENT ON FUNDING USED TO BENEFIT CHILDREN.—Not less than 50 percent of all Federal payments made to carry out agreements under this paragraph shall be used for initiatives that directly benefit children.

''(4) FEASIBILITY STUDY FUNDING.—

''(A) REQUESTS FOR FUNDING FOR FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—The Secretary shall reserve a portion of the amount reserved to carry out this subsection to assist States or local governments in developing feasibility studies to apply for social impact partnership funding under paragraph (2). To be eligible to receive funding to assist with completing a feasibility study, a State or local government shall submit an application for feasibility study funding addressing the following:

''(i) A description of the outcome goals of the social impact partnership project.

''(ii) A description of the intervention, including anticipated program design, target population, an estimate regarding the number of individuals to be served, and setting for the intervention.

''(iii) Evidence to support the likelihood that the intervention will produce the desired outcomes.

''(iv) A description of the potential metrics to be used.

''(v) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(vi) Estimated costs to conduct the project.

''(vii) Estimates of Federal, State, and local government savings and other savings if the project is implemented and the outcomes are achieved.

''(viii) An estimated timeline for implementation and completion of the project, which shall not exceed 10 years.

''(ix) With respect to a project for which the State or local government selects an intermediary to operate the project, any partnerships needed to successfully execute the project and the ability of the intermediary to foster the partnerships.

''(x) The expected resources needed to complete the feasibility study for the State or local government to apply for social impact partnership funding under paragraph (2).

''(B) FEDERAL SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY.—Not later than 6 months after receiving an application for feasibility study funding under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships and the head of any Federal agency administering a similar intervention or serving a population similar to that served by the project, shall select State or local government feasibility study proposals for funding based on the following:

''(i) The recommendations made by the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(ii) The likelihood that the proposal will achieve the desired outcomes.

''(iii) The value of the outcomes expected to be achieved.

''(iv) The potential savings to the Federal Government if the social impact partnership project is successful.

''(v) The potential savings to the State and local governments if the project is successful.

''(C) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Not later than 30 days after selecting a State or local government for feasibility study funding under this paragraph, the Secretary shall cause to be published on the website of the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships information explaining why a State or local government was granted feasibility study funding.

''(D) FUNDING RESTRICTION.—

''(i) FEASIBILITY STUDY RESTRICTION.—The Secretary may not provide feasibility study funding under this paragraph for more than 50 percent of the estimated total cost of the

feasibility study reported in the State or local government application submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) AGGREGATE RESTRICTION.—Of the total amount reserved to carry out this subsection, the Secretary may not use more than $10,000,000 to provide feasibility study funding to States or local governments under this paragraph.

''(iii) NO GUARANTEE OF FUNDING.—The Secretary shall have the option to award no funding under this paragraph.

''(E) SUBMISSION OF FEASIBILITY STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than 9 months after the receipt of feasibility study funding under this paragraph, a State or local government receiving the funding shall complete the feasibility study and submit the study to the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(F) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may transfer to the head of another Federal agency the authorities provided in this paragraph and any funds necessary to exercise the authorities.

''(5) EVALUATIONS.—

''(A) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS.—For each State or local government awarded a social impact partnership project approved by the Secretary under this subsection, the head of the relevant agency, as determined by the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, shall enter into an agreement with the State or local government to pay for all or part of the independent evaluation to determine whether the State or local government project has met an outcome specified in the agreement in order for the State or local government to receive outcome payments under this subsection.

''(B) EVALUATOR QUALIFICATIONS.—The head of the relevant agency may not enter into an agreement with a State or local government unless the head determines that the evaluator is independent of the other parties to the agreement and has demonstrated substantial experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of program effectiveness including, where available and appropriate, well-implemented randomized controlled trials on the intervention or similar interventions.

''(C) METHODOLOGIES TO BE USED.—The evaluation used to determine whether a State or local government will receive outcome payments under this subsection shall use experimental designs using random assignment or other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies, as certified by the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences when random assignment is not feasible.

''(D) PROGRESS REPORT.—

''(i) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The independent evaluator shall—

''(I) not later than 2 years after a project has been approved by the Secretary and biannually thereafter until the project is concluded, submit to the head of the relevant agency and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships a written report summarizing the progress that has been made in achieving each outcome specified in the agreement; and

''(II) before the scheduled time of the first outcome payment and before the scheduled time of each subsequent payment, submit to the head of the relevant agency and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships a written report that includes the results of the evaluation conducted to determine whether an outcome payment should be made along with information on the unique factors that contributed to achieving or failing to achieve the outcome, the challenges faced in attempting to achieve the outcome, and information on the improved future delivery of this or similar interventions.

''(ii) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the written report pursuant to clause (i)(II), the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships shall submit the report to each committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

''(E) FINAL REPORT.—

''(i) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Within 6 months after the social impact partnership project is completed, the independent evaluator shall—

''(I) evaluate the effects of the activities undertaken pursuant to the agreement with regard to each outcome specified in the agreement; and

''(II) submit to the head of the relevant agency and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships a written report that includes the results of the evaluation and the conclusion of the evaluator as to whether the State or local government has fulfilled each obligation of the agreement, along with information on the unique factors that contributed to the success or failure of the project, the challenges faced in attempting to achieve the outcome, and information on the improved future delivery of this or similar interventions.

''(ii) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the written report pursuant to clause (i)(II), the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships shall submit the report to each committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

''(F) LIMITATION ON COST OF EVALUATIONS.—Of the amount reserved under this subsection for social impact partnership projects, the Secretary may not obligate more than 15 percent to evaluate the implementation and outcomes of the projects.

''(G) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may transfer to the head of another Federal agency the authorities provided in this paragraph and any funds necessary to exercise the authorities.

''(6) FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Council') to—

''(i) coordinate the efforts of social impact partnership projects funded under this subsection;

''(ii) advise and assist the Secretary in the development and implementation of the projects;

''(iii) advise the Secretary on specific programmatic and policy matter related to the projects;

''(iv) provide subject-matter expertise to the Secretary with regard to the projects;

''(v) ensure that each State or local government that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary for a social impact partnership project under this subsection and each evaluator selected by the head of the relevant agency under paragraph (5) has access to Federal administrative data to assist the State or local government and the evaluator in evaluating the performance and outcomes of the project;

''(vi) address issues that will influence the future of social impact partnership projects in the United States;

''(vii) provide guidance to the executive branch on the future of social impact partnership projects in the United States;

''(viii) review State and local government applications for social impact partnerships to ensure that agreements will only be awarded under this subsection when rigorous, independent data and reliable, evidence-based research methodologies support the conclusion that an agreement will yield savings to the Federal Government if the project outcomes are achieved before the applications are approved by the Secretary;

''(ix) certify, in the case of each approved social impact partnership, that the project will yield a projected savings to the Federal Government if the project outcomes are achieved, and coordinate with the relevant Federal agency to produce an after-action accounting once the project is complete to determine the actual Federal savings realized, and the extent to which actual savings aligned with projected savings; and

''(x) provide oversight of the actions of the Secretary and other Federal officials under this subsection and report periodically to Congress and the public on the implementation of this subsection.

''(B) COMPOSITION OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall have 11 members, as follows:

''(i) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Council shall be the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(ii) OTHER MEMBERS.—The head of each of the following entities shall designate 1 officer or employee of the entity to be a Council member:

''(I) The Department of Labor.

''(II) The Department of Health and Human Services.

''(III) The Social Security Administration.

''(IV) The Department of Agriculture.

''(V) The Department of Justice.

''(VI) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

''(VII) The Department of Education.

''(VIII) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

''(IX) The Department of the Treasury.

''(X) The Corporation for National and Community Service.

''(7) COMMISSION ON SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Commission').

''(B) DUTIES.—The duties of the Commission shall be to—

''(i) assist the Secretary and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships in reviewing applications for funding under this subsection;

''(ii) make recommendations to the Secretary and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships regarding the funding of social impact partnership agreements and feasibility studies; and

''(iii) provide other assistance and information as requested by the Secretary or the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(C) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, of whom—

''(i) 1 shall be appointed by the President, who will serve as the Chair of the Commission;

''(ii) 1 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

''(iii) 1 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate;

''(iv) 1 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

''(v) 1 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;

''(vi) 1 shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

''(vii) 1 shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

''(viii) 1 member shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

''(ix) 1 shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

''(D) QUALIFICATIONS OF COMMISSION MEMBERS.—The members of the Commission shall—

''(i) be experienced in finance, economics, pay for performance, or program evaluation;

''(ii) have relevant professional or personal experience in a field related to 1 or more of the outcomes listed in this subsection; or

''(iii) be qualified to review applications for social impact partnership projects to determine whether the proposed metrics and evaluation methodologies are appropriately rigorous and reliant upon independent data and evidence-based research.

''(E) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, or, in the event of a vacancy, not later than 90 days after the date the vacancy arises. If a member of Congress fails to appoint a member by that date, the President may select a member of the President's choice on behalf of the member of Congress. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if not all appointments have been made to the Commission as of that date, the Commission may operate with no fewer than 5 members until all appointments have been made.

''(F) TERM OF APPOINTMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The members appointed under subparagraph (C) shall serve as follows:

''(I) 3 members shall serve for 2 years.

''(II) 3 members shall serve for 3 years.

''(III) 3 members (1 of which shall be Chair of the Commission appointed by the President) shall serve for 4 years.

''(ii) ASSIGNMENT OF TERMS.—The Commission shall designate the term length that each member appointed under subparagraph (C) shall serve by unanimous agreement. In the event that unanimous agreement cannot be reached, term lengths shall be assigned to the members by a random process.

''(G) VACANCIES.—Subject to subparagraph (E), in the event of a vacancy in the Commission, whether due to the resignation of a member, the expiration of a member's term, or any other reason, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers of the Commission.

''(H) APPOINTMENT POWER.—Members of the Commission appointed under subparagraph (C) shall not be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

''(8) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts reserved to carry out this subsection, the Secretary may not use more than $2,000,000 in any fiscal year to support the review, approval, and oversight of social impact partnership projects, including activities conducted by—

''(A) the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships; and

''(B) any other agency consulted by the Secretary before approving a social impact partnership project or a feasibility study under paragraph (4).

''(9) NO FEDERAL FUNDING FOR CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS.—No amount reserved to carry out this subsection may be used to provide any insurance, guarantee, or other credit enhancement to a State or local government under which a Federal payment would be made to a State or local government as the result of a State or local government failing to achieve an outcome specified in a contract.

''(10) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts reserved to carry out this subsection shall remain available until 10 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(11) WEBSITE.—The Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships shall establish and maintain a public website that shall display the following:

''(A) A copy of, or method of accessing, each notice published regarding a social impact partnership project pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) A copy of each feasibility study funded under this subsection.

''(C) For each State or local government that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary for a social impact partnership project, the website shall contain the following information:

''(i) The outcome goals of the project.

''(ii) A description of each intervention in the project.

''(iii) The target population that will be served by the project.

''(iv) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(v) The detailed roles, responsibilities, and purposes of each Federal, State, or local government entity, intermediary, service provider, independent evaluator, investor, or other stakeholder.

''(vi) The payment terms, methodology used to calculate outcome payments, the payment schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(vii) The project budget.

''(viii) The project timeline.

''(ix) The project eligibility criteria.

''(x) The evaluation design.

''(xi) The metrics used to determine whether the proposed outcomes have been achieved and how these metrics are measured.

''(D) A copy of the progress reports and the final reports relating to each social impact partnership project.

''(E) An estimate of the savings to the Federal, State, and local government, on a program-by-program basis and in the aggregate, resulting from the successful completion of the social impact partnership project.

''(12) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, may issue regulations as necessary to carry out this subsection.

''(13) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) INTERVENTION.—The term 'intervention' means a specific service delivered to achieve an impact through a social impact partnership project.

''(C) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(D) SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP PROJECT.—The term 'social impact partnership project' means a project that finances social services using a social impact partnership model.

''(E) SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP MODEL.—The term 'social impact partnership model' means a method of financing social services in which—

''(i) Federal funds are awarded to a State or local government only if a State or local government achieves certain outcomes agreed on by the State or local government and the Secretary; and

''(ii) the State or local government coordinates with service providers, investors (if applicable to the project), and (if necessary) an intermediary to identify—

''(I) an intervention expected to produce the outcome;

''(II) a service provider to deliver the intervention to the target population; and

''(III) investors to fund the delivery of the intervention.

''(F) STATE.—The term 'State' means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian tribe.

''(14) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available to carry out subsection (b) for fiscal year 2017, the Secretary shall reserve $100,000,000 to carry out this subsection.''.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF TANF PROGRAM.

(a) FAMILY ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Section 403(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(1)) is amended in each of subparagraphs (A) and (C), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

(b) HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROMOTION AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD GRANTS.—Section 403(a)(2)(D) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(2)(D)) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2017''.

(c) TRIBAL GRANTS.—Section 412(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 612(a)) is amended in each of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

(d) CHILD CARE ENTITLEMENT.—Section 418(a)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 618(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

(e) GRANTS TO THE TERRITORIES.—Section 1108(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

SEC. 4. STRENGTHENING WELFARE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 413 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 613) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 413. EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES AND RELATED PROGRAMS.

''(a) EVALUATION OF THE IMPACTS OF TANF.—The Secretary shall conduct research on the effect of State programs funded under this part and any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)) on employment, self-sufficiency, child well-being, unmarried births, marriage, poverty, economic mobility, and other factors as determined by the Secretary.

''(b) EVALUATION OF GRANTS TO IMPROVE CHILD WELL-BEING BY PROMOTING HEALTHY MARRIAGE AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD.—The Secretary shall conduct research to determine the effects of the grants made under section 403(a)(2) on child well-being, marriage, family stability, economic mobility, poverty, and other factors as determined by the Secretary.

''(c) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with States receiving funds provided under this part, develop methods of disseminating information on any research, evaluation, or study conducted under this section, including facilitating the sharing of information and best practices among States and localities.

''(d) STATE-INITIATED EVALUATIONS.—A State shall be eligible to receive funding to evaluate the State program funded under this part or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)) if—

''(1) the State submits to the Secretary a description of the proposed evaluation;

''(2) the Secretary determines that the design and approach of the proposed evaluation is rigorous and is likely to yield information that is credible and will be useful to other States; and

''(3) unless waived by the Secretary, the State contributes to the cost of the evaluation, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to at least 25 percent of the cost of the proposed evaluation.

''(e) CENSUS BUREAU RESEARCH.—

''(1) The Bureau of the Census shall implement or enhance household surveys of program participation, in consultation with the Secretary and the Burueau of Labor Statistics and made available to interested parties,

to allow for the assessment of the outcomes of continued welfare reform on the economic and child well-being of low-income families with children, including those who received assistance or services from a State program funded under this part or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)). The content of the surveys should include such information as may be necessary to examine the issues of unmarried childbearing, marriage, welfare dependency and compliance with work requirements, the beginning and ending of spells of assistance, work, earnings and employment stability, and the well-being of children.

''(2) To carry out the activities specified in paragraph (1), the Bureau of the Census, the Secretary, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall consider ways to improve the surveys and data derived from the surveys to—

''(A) address underreporting of the receipt of means-tested benefits and tax benefits for low-income individuals and families;

''(B) increase understanding of poverty spells and long-term poverty, including by facilitating the matching of information to better understand intergenerational poverty;

''(C) generate a better geographical understanding of poverty such as through State-based estimates and measures of neighborhood poverty;

''(D) increase understanding of the effects of means-tested benefits and tax benefits on the earnings of low-income families; and

''(E) improve how poverty and economic well-being are measured, including through the use of consumption measures.

''(f) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION CONDUCTED UNDER THIS SECTION.—Research and evaluation conducted under this section designed to determine the effects of a program or policy (other than research conducted under subsection (e)) shall use experimental designs using random assignment or other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences when random assignment is not feasible.

''(g) DEVELOPMENT OF WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE OF PROVEN AND PROMISING APPROACHES TO MOVE WELFARE RECIPIENTS INTO WORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall develop a database (which shall be referred to as the 'What Works Clearinghouse of Proven and Promising Projects to Move Welfare Recipients into Work') of the projects that used a proven approach or a promising approach in moving welfare recipients into work, based on independent, rigorous evaluations of the projects. The database shall include a separate listing of projects that used a developmental approach in delivering services and a further separate listing of the projects with no or negative effects. The Secretary shall add to the What Works Clearinghouse of Proven and Promising Projects to Move Welfare Recipients into Work data about the projects that, based on an independent, well-conducted experimental evaluation of a program or project, using random assignment or other research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences, have shown they are proven, promising, developmental, or ineffective approaches.

''(2) CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF APPROACH.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and organizations with experience in evaluating research on the effectiveness of various approaches in delivering services to move welfare recipients into work, shall—

''(A) establish criteria for evidence of effectiveness; and

''(B) ensure that the process for establishing the criteria—

''(i) is transparent;

''(ii) is consistent across agencies;

''(iii) provides opportunity for public comment; and

''(iv) takes into account efforts of Federal agencies to identify and publicize effective interventions, including efforts at the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, and the Department of Justice.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) APPROACH.—The term 'approach' means a process, product, strategy, or practice that is—

''(i) research-based, based on the results of 1 or more empirical studies, and linked to program-determined outcomes; and

''(ii) evaluated using rigorous research designs.

''(B) PROVEN APPROACH.—The term 'proven approach' means an approach that—

''(i) meets the requirements of a promising approach; and

''(ii) has demonstrated significant positive outcomes at more than 1 site in terms of increasing work and earnings of participants, reducing poverty and dependence, or strengthening families.

''(C) PROMISING APPROACH.—The term 'promising approach' means an approach—

''(i) that meets the requirements of subparagraph (D)(i);

''(ii) that has been evaluated using well-designed and rigorous randomized controlled or quasi-experimental research designs;

''(iii) that has demonstrated significant positive outcomes at only 1 site in terms of increasing work and earnings of participants, reducing poverty and dependence, or strengthening families; and

''(iv) under which the benefits of the positive outcomes have exceeded the costs of achieving the outcomes.

''(D) DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH.—The term 'developmental approach' means an approach that—

''(i) is research-based, grounded in relevant empirically-based knowledge, and linked to program-determined outcomes;

''(ii) is evaluated using rigorous research designs; and

''(iii) has yet to demonstrate a significant positive outcome in terms of increasing work and earnings of participants in a cost-effective way.

''(h) APPROPRIATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount appropriated by section 403(a)(1) for each fiscal year, 0.33 percent shall be available for research and evaluation under this section.

''(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available $10,000,000 plus such additional amount as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate, to carry out subsection (e).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 403(a)(1)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting '', reduced by the percentage specified in section 413(h) with respect to the fiscal year,'' before ''as the amount''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 611(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable Federal law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable Federal law.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than the date that is 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule that—

(1) identifies federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges; and

(2) specifies State implementation options and describes future milestones.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 5170, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For all our best intentions, we too often see government programs fail both the constituencies they are intended to help and the taxpayers who fund them.

Thousands of families across this country continue to be trapped, generation after generation, in programs that were well intended but are now ineffective or outdated. Our social safety net has instead become a poverty trap

and not the springboard to prosperity we once envisioned.

Our constituents, all Americans, deserve better. They need their Federal Government working together with their communities to focus on how we can help members of our society successfully climb that ladder out of poverty, not just check them off as another individual served.

By changing the Federal Government's definition of success in Federal social programs, from inputs to actual outcomes, we can help our fellow Americans overcome the root causes of poverty and seize economic opportunities to work and provide for our families. It is this shift in focus, this focus from inputs to outcomes, that could substantially transform our safety net to better serve our most vulnerable.

The Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act does just that. It empowers States, local governments, nonprofits, and the private sector to scale up evidence-based interventions that address our Nation's most pressing social challenges.

This legislation would foster the creation of public-private partnerships that harness philanthropic and other private-sector investments so we can expand and replicate scientifically proven social and public health programs. Because social impact partnerships are focused on achieving real results, government dollars are paid out only when desired outcomes are met.

Furthermore, this legislation would reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program at current spending levels for 1 year as well as build evidence on our efforts to help our most needy families find jobs and achieve self-sufficiency by cataloging the best evidence-based approaches.

The What Works Clearinghouse would make it easier for States to know which approaches have been tested using independent, rigorous evaluations and, based on those results, an understanding of their effectiveness in achieving positive results for individuals and families.

By cataloging the different approaches States are taking in helping welfare recipients move into work, we can help empower well-intentioned policymakers across all levels of government to improve lives through evidence-based policymaking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, program expires at the end of September. We need to extend this program, and this legislation accomplishes that goal; but we have so much more to do.

Once TANF is temporarily extended, our committee and this Congress should work toward a more comprehensive review and reauthorization of the program. We need to make sure that spending under TANF is focused on the core missions of helping needy families and promoting work. We need to further open opportunities to education and training so that TANF recipients can prepare for and find good jobs. And we need to ensure that adequate child care and other supports are available for low-income parents in the workforce.

Of course, if we are serious about reducing poverty, improving TANF must be part of a broader agenda that seeks to help Americans endeavoring to help themselves. We should substantially increase the minimum wage for hard-working Americans, expanding the earned income tax credit to childless workers, and expanding access to affordable housing. By the way, those are inputs that relate to outputs and outcomes. And we should be building on successful programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Social Services Block Grant, and the Affordable Care Act.

Instead, the agenda we have seen from the Republican leadership of this House is to block meaningful improvements or, even worse, to gut programs that now provide opportunities for Americans. Eliminating the Social Services Block Grant, as Republicans propose, will make child care less available, making it harder for low-income parents to go to work. Cutting funding for education and training, as the Republican budget suggests, would have the same effect of blocking a path to work. And repealing the Affordable Care Act, as Republicans have voted repeatedly to do, would make it harder for people to move into work and to move between jobs. Republicans say they support work, but time and time again, they oppose work supports.

The programs that arose out of the war on poverty reduced poverty by over 40 percent, despite erroneous claims to the contrary by some of our Republican colleagues. However, at the same time, we still have 47 million Americans who live in poverty. These struggling families deserve real action, not more of the same old failed policies and empty rhetoric that we have heard in the report from the Republican House Poverty Task Force several weeks ago. And they certainly deserve better than huge cuts to programs they depend on.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because it extends the TANF program, a necessary program for low-income families. The bill also includes a 1-year allocation to test social impact partnerships in which the private, nonprofit, and government sectors attempt to come together to address certain social problems.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As someone who was raised by a single mother when my father passed when I was 2 years old, and having 11 older brothers and sisters, poverty is something that I know firsthand and that we have seen firsthand in our household.

As we go forward and we deal with extending TANF cash welfare for 1 year, I think what Mr. YOUNG of Indiana has done is try to put forward innovative ideas that change the dialogue, that change the debate when it comes to our antipoverty measures out of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, no longer should we measure the success of a program just by the amount of money we spend on that program, but measure it by the lives that are positively changed.

□ 1745

That is what this social impact bonding legislation is all about. It is rewarding and standing with people who are moving out of poverty, standing on their own two feet.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this critical legislation as we care for those young men and women, as well as those adults who live in poverty, and break that cycle once and for all.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill which Mr. YOUNG brings to the floor this afternoon concerns five-tenths of 1 percent of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. I want to talk about the other 99.5 percent, and I will address the 0.5 percent—the five-tenths—a little later.

Overall, this legislation perpetuates the myth of compassionate conservatism that was originally spun by George W. Bush. It involves a Republican strategy that we have seen over the last few weeks to block every single Democratic proposal that would reform welfare to work, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families as it is formally known.

I favor full reform of TANF, to pursue the original objectives of the 1996 welfare reform that I supported to end generational poverty and help poor Americans who are not physically able to work. TANF would permit them to climb up the economic ladder into the middle class while supporting those who are unable to work.

Instead, what we are presented is one modest, unproven social experiment paid for at the expense of poor children. Over the last 20 years, the total resources that are available to get people from welfare to work have steadily declined. Today's legislation is just one more small cut to those resources.

Republicans previously terminated one major part of TANF that helped States with poor populations, like Texas, whacking out $319 million from

the program. What we have left with TANF today is about one-third of the purchasing power that it had 20 years ago when we adopted the reform. In Texas, about 1 in 20 children receive assistance from TANF. Folks who need a life vest are instead given an anchor.

While it may have had some initial positive impact, the 1996 welfare law has become an example of a failed Federal block grant program. Through the years, the States have diverted more and more moneys that were intended to support poor mothers finding the education and training that they needed and the childcare and placement services they needed to go out and have the dignity of a livable wage, longterm job, and now the States are spending, on average, 8 cents of every dollar on work and another 16 cents on child care.

To the extent that President Johnson's War on Poverty has not been fully won, much of the responsibility goes to those who refuse to fight, who surrendered at the first obstacle, who engaged in passive resistance, and, in places like Texas, who just abandoned the field of battle when it came to protecting their poorest citizens. Clearly, the social safety net that TANF was supposed to be has become mostly hole and little net.

If this is a poverty trap, as we have heard, it is because our Republican colleagues have shut the door on any efforts to unlock it with the exception of this one bill. Now with their recently announced poverty plan, they want to take the same kind of thinking—these failed block grants—and apply it to the national school lunch program, apply it to Medicaid, and according to one of their exhibits, to everything from Pell grants to cervical cancer, blocking it all together, and then putting the victims on the chopping block.

Beginning last summer, I encouraged now-Speaker RYAN and other Republicans to support a reform, basically saying to them: I know you are not going to give another dime to help the poor, but at least ask the States to use the moneys that they already have from the Federal Government to accomplish the law's original objectives and stop diverting this money to plug budget loopholes. Unfortunately, TANF is still a welfare program, but it is Republican Governors, largely, who are on the dole, who take this Federal money and don't use it for the purposes for which it was originally intended.

Last year, even Speaker RYAN recognized that existing TANF limitations impair the ability of the poor to get the educational opportunities that they need to get good jobs. Five Republicans, including a couple from our committee, offered the Preparing More Welfare Recipients for Work Act, which doubled the time that was permitted for educational training to count as a work activity, and as one of them—our colleague, Mr. TIBERI—said, these commonsense reforms streamline and simplify complicated work requirements, leading to higher enrollment in work or job training programs. It was common sense then, but as soon as it was attacked by rightwing ideologues, they ran away from it.

Republicans could join us in reforming TANF to make it a true pathway to work and into the middle class, but they have declined to do that. Instead of offering a reauthorization, they split TANF up into six pieces that did not continue it. Part of the same package that hasn't been brought to the floor this afternoon are two other bills.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD our dissenting views to those bills.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2016.

DISSENTING VIEWS FOR H.R. 2959

What began as a legislative step forward has become a step backward. What did some modest good, now does harm. As introduced, the TANF Accountability and Integrity Improvement Act (H.R. 2959) would have closed a loophole that a few states have created and exploited to avoid providing their state match for the federal TANF block grant. This loophole unfairly misapplies third-party spending as if it were state spending.

The non-partisan General Accountability Office (GAO) has criticized this wrongful approach, which shortchanges poor children and their parents. I fully support the bill's complete closure of this loophole that only a few states exploit to avoid providing their fair share of support for moving their impoverished residents from welfare to work.

Unfortunately, only hours prior to the Committee markup, this bill was amended to do the opposite of what it originally would have accomplished. As amended, it legalizes this unfair loophole by grandfathering in current offenders. Now it does little more than prevent other states from following the leadership of a few pioneers in abuse. Why reward those states who balance their books on the backs of those least able to bear the burden?

According to the GAO, Georgia is the chief offender, with nearly 60 percent of its TANF contributions coming from private entities. Not only is it not making its proper match to access federal funds, but Georgia also consistently ignores the needs of its poorest citizens. For every TANF dollar, Georgia uses 80 cents for in ways that ignore the core purposes of TANF—work, direct assistance and child care.

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) should have already initiated action to close this unjustified loophole. As amended, the bill would now prevent HHS from collecting this abuse. It should be rejected.

LLOYD DOGGETT.
JIM MCDERMOTT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 2016.

DISSENTING VIEWS FOR H.R. 2952

The Committee has considered multiple bills regarding Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) without actually extending TANF, which expires in four months. The reason for so many different TANF bills and a refusal to consider an extension in Committee is to block Members from offering genuine reforms of TANF designed to make it function more effectively, to avoid state diversion of TANF funds away from core TANF purposes, and to do more to help TANF recipients move into good, sustainable jobs. This is accomplished through a maneuver claiming that any significant reform that any member proposes is not germane to any of the narrow bills in question. Indeed, the Committee refused to consider an amendment that would simply have extended the expiring TANF program for another fiscal year on grounds that it was not germane.

This particular part of the Republican TANF package concerns data on wages and employment status, but unfortunately a belated amendment to it would make that data a less accurate measure of the effectiveness of State efforts to move people into work. The revised bill manipulates numbers, creating the misimpression that those who cannot work because of age or disability refuse to work. Furthermore, this bill does not provide a measure of the percentage of those leaving TANF who have found work. It would be insightful to learn whether a state has simply forced an individual off TANF or actually helped them to secure a job through which they can support their family.

We strongly support an accurate employment outcomes measure that can offer insight regarding whether state programs are really malcing a difference in moving people from welfare to real, wage-paying, longterm employment and providing opportunity for individuals to work their way out of poverty. This bill's flaws undercut that goal, and unfortunately the Majority rejected an amendment that would have corrected these shortcomings.

Representatives Sander Levin, Charles B. Rangel, John Lewis, Xavier Becerra, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Lloyd Doggett, Jim McDermott, Richard E. Neal, Earl Blumenauer, John B. Larson, Ron Kind, Danny Davis, Mike Thompson, Joseph Crowley, Linda Sanchez.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we have here is an attempt to also add by amendment the very reauthorization that I sought to offer in committee that was blocked then. I guess today will be the first time even our Republican colleagues learn what has been done with this authorization.

Overall, what we have had is a Republican roadblock to real welfare reform and poverty reduction that this Congress should be focused on, and it obviously will take a new President and a new Congress to do it. Like the compassionate conservatism of George W. Bush, Republicans are offering us a slogan, not a solution.

The same day that they rejected our efforts to deal with this issue, they were all about more tax breaks. Their poverty agenda is a collection of retreads that offer little hope for change. It only demonstrates that their approach to poverty is indeed impoverished.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my good friend from Indiana for yielding and for his work on this important legislation. I also want to thank my good friend from Maryland, who has also put a lot of work into what I think is really a unique piece of legislation. I want to make sure that I rise in support of the Social

Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act.

This reform-minded legislation, Mr. Speaker, is so important because it offers a fresh approach for the way that the Federal Government assists those who are truly in need. It focuses our efforts on evidence-based reforms.

How refreshing is that?

We spend a tremendous amount of money, Mr. Speaker, trying to make sure that we are giving people an opportunity to get out from being impoverished. We have too many people today, Mr. Speaker, around the country who are fighting poverty. This actually brings entrepreneurs, nonprofits, and the government together to actually solve these problems.

The Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act is a bipartisan solution that rewards and promotes programs that actually help individuals achieve positive outcomes. It actually helps and relieves the taxpayers a tremendous burden. No longer are the taxpayers on the hook for failed programs. This actually is providing the opportunity for entrepreneurs and those who are in the nonprofit sector to also play a role in trying to actually come up with unique solutions in very different ways in State-by-State outcomes. This innovative piece of legislation will give the States more flexibility to be creative with TANF dollars and establish approaches that will uniquely address the problems facing local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will also serve as an extension of the TANF program to make sure that we continue to provide necessary assistance to individuals looking to achieve self-sufficiency through job training and education.

The challenges we face in fighting poverty are clearly steep. We know that in the War on Poverty, we have spent over $22 trillion to move the needle from 15 percent in poverty to 14.6 percent in poverty. We need to start thinking creatively about how can we focus on outcomes, how can we get more people off of the unemployment rolls, how can we get more people off the TANF rolls, off the welfare rolls. This is a program, this is an idea, a bipartisan reform that is going to focus on outcomes and will help start solving the problem. It does require meaningful action.

I believe that the American Dream revolves around the idea that each and every one of us has something positive to contribute to our great Nation. This legislation is a step in the right direction in helping individuals reach their full potential, and gives States flexibility.

Again, I want to go back and I want to thank my good friend from Maryland for his work on this and my friend from Indiana for, again, working in a bipartisan way to start thinking outside of the box. The government doesn't always have the solution, and we need to leverage nonprofits. We need to leverage those who are working out there and bringing unique ideas to the fold.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a leading advocate for social impact financing and, I know, a partner of Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Texas for yielding me this time, and I want to express my support for his comments and associate myself with his comments. He has been a singular champion of the TANF program and the goals that it represents. I appreciate his work and the opportunity to work with him on this bill.

I also want to thank my good friend and colleague from Indiana. We have spent a considerable amount of time working on this piece of legislation together, talking to groups, and he has been a wonderful champion and it has been a real pleasure to work with him on this concept.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I spent my whole career as an entrepreneur in the private sector building businesses. The one thing I would observe from that experience whenever I would travel around the United States, or around the world for that matter, whenever you saw good economic outcomes and broad-based prosperity for the citizens, you always found a situation where the government, the nonprofit sector, and the private sector worked well together to solve the problems in society, and it is that spirit that animates the social impact partnership that we are here to discuss this evening.

If you think about what is going on in the world today, Mr. Speaker, and the changes that are playing out in our economy based on technological innovation and global interconnection, you realize that it has helped many of our citizens and it has helped billions of people around the world, but it has also hurt many of our citizens. It happened too fast; we weren't quite prepared for it; and chronic and vexing issues like poverty, educational disparities, income and opportunity disparities have only grown based on these trends.

To make a difference against these problems, Mr. Speaker, we need to do several things. First, we need to invest. You cannot definitionally make transformative changes, whether it be in the private sector or the public sector, unless you make investments.

The second thing we need, Mr. Speaker, is we need innovation. We need the best ideas to be applied against some of these very difficult challenges that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we also need a new sense and spirit of collaboration and cooperation among all the stakeholders because the government right now has three significant problems when it tries to tackle these issues.

The first problem it has is a funding problem. Whether it is the condition of the Federal budget or the State budget, it is very difficult for the government to make investments.

The second issue the government has is an innovation problem. Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that the government has never been the incubator necessarily of great innovation. It has been good at investing, but we find more innovation often outside of government. Right now that gap is growing. So the government has an innovation problem.

The third problem the government has is a transparency problem. I used to say in business that if you can't measure it, you can't manage it. And we are not getting enough data in terms of a positive feedback loop to look at some of these issues and see what works and what doesn't work. That is why Pay for Success frameworks and social impact partnerships can make such a big difference because it solves those problems, it creates pathways for more capital, more investments to flow from the nonprofit sector or the private sector against issues that have traditionally been funded by the government.

□ 1800

It creates pathways for innovation and best ideas and new ideas to flow into the government sector, and it creates a pathway and a framework for more transparency and more metrics as it relates to what the results are.

Whether it is supplied against early childhood education, recidivism issues, chronic healthcare issues like asthma, whatever the framework can be, this approach can create an opportunity for more investment, which we need; more innovation, which we need; greater metrics and transparency, which we need; and a renewed spirit of cooperation between the government, the private sector, and the nonprofit sector to make a difference against these problems, which is why I am very supportive of the social impact partnership framework, the Pay for Success framework.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, but I also encourage my colleagues to think seriously about what my colleague from Texas said about the larger TANF program, because there is so much more to be done.

I do believe launching the social impact partnership framework can lead to transformative changes against these very, very difficult issues and create a situation where prosperity is shared more broadly and there is more opportunity for Americans, particularly our American colleagues who have been so affected negatively by some of the larger changes that are going on in the world.

I encourage adoption of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), my colleague.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act.

As founding co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Social Investment Taskforce, I believe that we can harness the power of market forces and private capital to solve local problems, benefit American taxpayers, and uplift communities. This bill will encourage the private sector to invest in some of the most pressing challenges we face as a nation.

I believe in the power of government to be a force for good, but after 30 years in business, I tremendously believe in the untapped potential of the private market to solve problems. The goal of this bill is to unleash that power of the private sector to work with local governments and communities.

This bill is based on the pay for results model, in which Federal funds are only spent when measurable results have been achieved. Instead of simply creating more government programs, this saves taxpayer dollars by ensuring funds are only spent on successful programs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative TODD YOUNG and my fellow co-chair of the taskforce, Representative JOHN DELANEY, for introducing this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I salute and appreciate the commitment of Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DELANEY to seek new ways to try to combat some old problems. We need creativity to address these challenges. There is no one single approach that will solve all these problems. Where I disagree with them is over how they choose to fund this initiative—a choice that I think they probably personally did not make—and the lack of safeguards to assure their very laudable objectives.

This bill takes money that has always been dedicated to benefit vulnerable children away from the Department of Health and Human Services and authorized its expenditure for other purposes that may be very well intentioned, but that have absolutely nothing to do with vulnerable children.

Now is not the time to further reduce this funding for needy children just because it happens to be an easy place to take money from. It is only $100 million, only five-tenths of a percent of the total TANF budget, but I can tell you that it is hard to come by $100 million to do anything to try to help vulnerable children, and it is a loss to have that money taken away.

It is true that President Obama finally, after almost 8 years of his administration, proposed that the contingency fund be repurposed and that money be added to family assistance grants and require the States to use more of the resources they get from TANF for the purposes of TANF to prevent two-generational poverty. The President's approach was to use the TANF contingency fund for a pathway to jobs initiative and a generational poverty initiative, not to take it out for other purposes. Today, this contingency fund is simply viewed as the easiest place to get money for what is not an evidence-based approach, but may still have merit.

In committee, I sought to protect at least some of these moneys for children. I appreciate the fact that Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DELANEY have been receptive and have incorporated in the amended version today a measure that will assure that at least half of the money taken away from TANF is allocated for children, with the focus being on helping those poor children who would otherwise have benefited from the money had it stayed with TANF.

Social impact financing offers the potential of greater private investment and resources to tackle some of the serious social ills that our country confronts. Without approving any new legislation, there is no restriction right now on any of our States from going out and using TANF money for social impact financing, so long as they focus on the statutory purposes of TANF. If these laboratories of democracy can do it already, then I think that is probably sufficient.

I do know that there are a number of young entrepreneurs with a social conscience—a number of them I have talked with in Austin, Texas—who want to apply their talents to resolve ills that they see around them. There are a number of feasibility studies already underway in Austin concerning some of the problems that we have in Texas.

But not everyone who applies for these funds will have the outlook of Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DELANEY, some of our colleagues who have come to the floor, and some of these young entrepreneurs because, unfortunately, with the starving of our social service and educational sector, one community after another is so desperate for funds to fight child abuse or neglect that they are willing to do almost anything that they might be sold upon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a list of safeguards that I hope the gentlemen will consider as this bill proceeds to the Senate.

In designing a new program with $100 million in taxpayer funds, which is designed to ultimately attract many additional taxpayer funds, to an initiative that is not evidence-based, we need to ensure that those dollars are not squandered. And after the Wall Street bailouts, many Americans question whether Wall Street is the place to turn to address social challenges. We have to consider the possibility of the unscrupulous offering false hope to a desperate local community.

In Committee, I raised a list of questions about the lack of adequate safeguards. A state or locality may encounter substantial costs in administering the programs, between fees owed to intermediaries, service providers, evaluators and the like. This bill caps the amount that may be expended on feasibility studies to evaluate a social impact financing proposal, but it places no cap on underwriting costs, which Wall Street firms can charge. The bill puts no limit on the returns an investor can gain in one of these projects. It has no limit on who can determine what "success" is in one of these proposals. This bill fails to require a clear cost/benefit analysis that includes as a cost the cost of any related feasibility study.

Even without proper safeguards, it is far from certain how many proposals will actually qualify for funding under this bill. Indeed, the Congressional Budget Office notes that "because there is uncertainty as to the extent states conducting the projects will achieve the measurable outcomes required for federal reimbursement, CBO estimates that not all of the funds reserved for the program will be spent.

House Republicans have been so eager to gain approval of any new idea they can claim responds to poverty and related social needs that this proposal has emerged without careful evaluation. Hopefully, the Senate in its legislative process can correct some of these shortcomings, and the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget can include additional safeguards in implementing this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bipartisan, bicameral bill was developed over the course of 2 years, incorporating feedback from a variety of stakeholders, ranging from State and local governments to child welfare organizations.

I want to thank these stakeholders, as well as give very special recognition to my colleague, Congressman DELANEY, my Democratic colleague from Maryland, for his leadership and partnership with me on this initiative.

I would also be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the substantial and impressive efforts of members of our staff, from the Ways and Means committee staff, Ryan Martin, to my own personal office staff, Jaymi Light, who literally authored this legislation—we went through about 50 different versions until we got it right—to Xan Fishman of Congressman DELANEY's staff, for his hard work. This was a team effort. This is the sort of big idea, bipartisan teamwork we need more of in Washington, D.C. All of you have helped make it happen here today.

I want to thank my fellow Ways and Means colleagues who are cosponsors of this legislation for their leadership and continued support.

Social impact partnerships address our moral responsibilities to ensure that social programs actually improve recipients' lives, and do so in a fiscally prudent manner. But they also respond to the imperative of improving our economic health by harnessing the capabilities of every able-bodied citizen. Our safety net must reflect our country's belief that, without exception, Americans aren't liabilities to be written off but, instead, assets to be realized.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5170, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH CARE RELIEF ACT OF 2016

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5447) to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5447

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Health Care Relief Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION FROM GROUP HEALTH PLAN REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 AND THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9831 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title (except as provided in section 4980I(f)(4) and notwithstanding any other provision of this title), the term 'group health plan' shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement.

''(2) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement' means an arrangement which—

''(i) is described in subparagraph (B), and

''(ii) is provided on the same terms to all eligible employees of the eligible employer.

''(B) ARRANGEMENT DESCRIBED.—An arrangement is described in this subparagraph if—

''(i) such arrangement is funded solely by an eligible employer and no salary reduction contributions may be made under such arrangement,

''(ii) such arrangement provides, after the employee provides proof of coverage, for the payment of, or reimbursement of, an eligible employee for expenses for medical care (as defined in section 213(d)) incurred by the eligible employee or the eligible employee's family members (as determined under the terms of the arrangement), and

''(iii) the amount of payments and reimbursements described in clause (ii) for any year do not exceed $5,130 ($10,260 in the case of an arrangement that also provides for payments or reimbursements for family members of the employee).

''(C) CERTAIN VARIATION PERMITTED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), an arrangement shall not fail to be treated as provided on the same terms to each eligible employee merely because the employee's permitted benefits under such arrangement vary in accordance with the variation in the price of an insurance policy in the relevant individual health insurance market based on—

''(i) the age of the eligible employee (and, in the case of an arrangement which covers medical expenses of the eligible employee's family members, the age of such family members), or

''(ii) the number of family members of the eligible employee the medical expenses of which are covered under such arrangement.

The variation permitted under the preceding sentence shall be determined by reference to the same insurance policy with respect to all eligible employees.

''(D) RULES RELATING TO MAXIMUM DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

''(i) AMOUNT PRORATED IN CERTAIN CASES.—In the case of an individual who is not covered by an arrangement for the entire year, the limitation under subparagraph (A)(iii) for such year shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would (but for this clause) be in effect for such individual for such year under subparagraph (A)(iii) as the number of months for which such individual is covered by the arrangement for such year bears to 12.

''(ii) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any year beginning after 2016, each of the dollar amounts in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any dollar amount increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $100, such dollar amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $100.

''(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term 'eligible employee' means any employee of an eligible employer, except that the terms of the arrangement may exclude from consideration employees described in any clause of section 105(h)(3)(B) (applied by substituting '90 days' for '3 years' in clause (i) thereof).

''(B) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—The term 'eligible employer' means an employer that—

''(i) is not an applicable large employer as defined in section 4980H(c)(2), and

''(ii) does not offer a group health plan to any of its employees.

''(C) PERMITTED BENEFIT.—The term 'permitted benefit' means, with respect to any eligible employee, the maximum dollar amount of payments and reimbursements which may be made under the terms of the qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for the year with respect to such employee.

''(4) NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer funding a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for any year shall, not later than 90 days before the beginning of such year (or, in the case of an employee who is not eligible to participate in the arrangement as of the beginning of such year, the date on which such employee is first so eligible), provide a written notice to each eligible employee which includes the information described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall include each of the following:

''(i) A statement of the amount which would be such eligible employee's permitted benefits under the arrangement for the year.

''(ii) A statement that the eligible employee should provide the information described in clause (i) to any health insurance exchange to which the employee applies for advance payment of the premium assistance tax credit.

''(iii) A statement that if the employee is not covered under minimum essential coverage for any month the employee may be subject to tax under section 5000A for such month and reimbursements under the arrangement may be includible in gross income.''.

(2) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME.—Section 106 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this section and section 105, payments or reimbursements from a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)) of an individual for medical care (as defined in section 213(d)) shall not be treated as paid or reimbursed under employer-provided coverage for medical expenses under an accident or health plan if for the month in which such medical care is provided the individual does not have minimum essential coverage (within the meaning of section 5000A(f)).''.

(3) COORDINATION WITH HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM CREDIT.—Section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'coverage month' shall not include any month with respect to an employee (or any spouse or dependent of such employee) if for such month the employee is provided a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement which constitutes affordable coverage.

''(B) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—In the case of any employee who is provided a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for any coverage month (determined without regard to subparagraph (A)), the credit otherwise allowable under subsection (a) to the taxpayer for such month shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount described in subparagraph (C)(i)(II) for such month.

''(C) AFFORDABLE COVERAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement shall be treated as constituting affordable coverage for a month if—

''(i) the excess of—

''(I) the amount that would be paid by the employee as the premium for such month for self-only coverage under the second lowest cost silver plan offered in the relevant individual health insurance market, over

''(II) 1/12 of the employee's permitted benefit (as defined in section 9831(d)(3)(C)) under such arrangement, does not exceed—

''(ii) 1/12 of 9.5 percent of the employee's household income.

''(D) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement' has the meaning given such term by section 9831(d)(2).

''(E) COVERAGE FOR LESS THAN ENTIRE YEAR.—In the case of an employee who is provided a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for less than an entire year, subparagraph (C)(i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'the number of months during the year for which such arrangement was provided' for '12'.

''(F) INDEXING.—In the case of plan years beginning in any calendar year after 2014, the Secretary shall adjust the 9.5 percent amount under subparagraph (C)(ii) in the same manner as the percentages are adjusted under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii).''.

(4) APPLICATION OF EXCISE TAX ON HIGH COST EMPLOYER-SPONSORED HEALTH COVERAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980I(f)(4) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Section 9831(d)(1) shall not apply for purposes of this section.''.

(B) DETERMINATION OF COST OF COVERAGE.—Section 4980I(d)(2) of such Code is amended by

redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—In the case of applicable employer-sponsored coverage consisting of coverage under any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2)), the cost of coverage shall be equal to the amount described in section 6051(a)(15).''.

(5) ENFORCEMENT OF NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—Section 6652 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICES WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—In the case of each failure to provide a written notice as required by section 9831(d)(4), unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect, there shall be paid, on notice and demand of the Secretary and in the same manner as tax, by the person failing to provide such written notice, an amount equal to $50 per employee per incident of failure to provide such notice, but the total amount imposed on such person for all such failures during any calendar year shall not exceed $2,500.''.

(6) REPORTING.—

(A) W–2 REPORTING.—Section 6051(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

''(15) the total amount of permitted benefit (as defined in section 9831(d)(3)(C)) for the year under a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2)) with respect to the employee.''.

(B) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED BY EXCHANGE SUBSIDY APPLICANTS.—Section 1411(b)(3) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE POLICIES OBTAINED THROUGH SMALL EMPLOYERS.—The amount of the enrollee's permitted benefit (as defined in section 9831(d)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) under a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of such Code).''.

(7) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to years beginning after the earlier of—

(i) the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(ii) December 31, 2016.

(B) TRANSITION RELIEF.—The relief under Treasury Notice 2015–17 shall be treated as applying to any plan year beginning on or before the date described in subparagraph (A).

(C) COORDINATION WITH HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM CREDIT.—The amendments made by paragraph (3) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(D) EMPLOYEE NOTICE.—The amendments made by paragraph (5) shall apply to notices with respect to years beginning after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(E) W–2 REPORTING.—The amendments made by paragraph (6)(A) shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2016.

(F) INFORMATION PROVIDED BY EXCHANGE SUBSIDY APPLICANTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (6)(B) shall apply to applications for enrollment made after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(ii) VERIFICATION.—Verification under section 1411 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of information provided under section 1411(b)(3)(B) of such Act shall apply with respect to months beginning after October 2016.

(8) SUBSTANTIATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or his designee) may issue substantiation requirements as necessary to carry out this subsection.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 733(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(2) EXCEPTION FROM CONTINUATION COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS, ETC.—Section 607(1) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1167(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after the date described in subsection (a)(7)(A).

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2791(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Except for purposes of part C of title XI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d et seq.), such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(2) EXCEPTION FROM CONTINUATION COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2208(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300bb–8(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after the date described in subsection (a)(7)(A).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5447, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to stand here before you to offer this bill.

This is a very important bill, H.R. 5447, the Small Business Health Care Relief Act. It is bipartisan legislation that has been more than 2 years in the making.

Mr. Speaker, as a small-business owner and a heart surgeon, I understand how important coverage is to get good, high-quality health care. But I also understand, from the standpoint of being a small-business owner, how difficult it often is and how expensive it has become to provide this kind of coverage for employees.

In 2013, Treasury issued regulatory guidance indicating that any employer offering health reimbursement accounts, also known as HRAs, was in violation of the Affordable Care Act group health plan requirements, irrespective of the size of the employer. The very smallest of small businesses were affected by this, businesses that were trying to help their employees, doing the very best they can to help their employees have coverage.

Furthermore, Treasury's guidance included an astronomically high penalty fine assessed on employers offering these HRAs: $100 per day per employee, with the potential of accruing a $36,500 fine per year per employee. This is just draconian treatment for small business.

In my home State of Louisiana, small businesses—those with 50 or fewer employees—account for 72 percent of all businesses in Louisiana. Yet only about 30 percent of those small businesses offer a specific group health plan, often citing the full cost of group health plans as the reason for offering nothing. I am sure this is the case all around the country.

We have to help small businesses and their employees afford good coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON, for working with me on this bill to give small-business owners an opportunity to financially assist their employees with their health costs.

This legislation will be critical to ensuring that small businesses in Louisiana and around the country have an option that allows them to help their employees afford health coverage and costs. When 65 percent of those in Louisiana who are currently uninsured, indeed, have a full-time worker in their household and nearly three-quarters of all employers in Louisiana are small businesses, it is clear we can do better. This is something that will actually help these small-business owners and their employees get affordable coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the government must not penalize small-business owners for doing the right thing and trying to help employees with the high cost of healthcare coverage, so I urge swift passage of this legislation to empower our small-business owners.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the reforms in the Affordable Care Act banned employer-sponsored health plans from placing annual dollar limits on benefits paid by the plan to a beneficiary. This is good policy, as, for example, we don't want patients with

cancer finding out their insurance company only pays a set amount for their treatment and no more. But it has had the unintended effect of prohibiting stand-alone Health Reimbursement Arrangements because they are employer-sponsored health plans under which benefits are limited to a specified dollar amount.

HRAs are typically used by beneficiaries for out-of-pocket medical expenses such as meeting an insurance plan's annual deductible or co-pays for doctor and other medical provider visits. HRAs can also be used to pay for premiums for health insurance coverage.

The bill before us would permit small employers to offer stand-alone HRAs to their employees, referred to as ''qualified small employer HRA.'' This bill would also permit the use of the qualified small employer HRAs to purchase coverage in the ACA's public marketplaces.

I am pleased to see my Republican colleagues recognizing the benefit of the ACA marketplaces and coverage they offer to millions of Americans. This bill is yet another important way to support the ACA, ensuring more Americans have the health coverage and flexibility they need through the marketplaces. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), one of the sponsors of this bill, and a distinguished member of our committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), who is the chairman of the Physicians Caucus.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Small Business Health Care Relief Act.

I want to thank my colleagues, Dr. BOUSTANY and Representative THOMPSON, for their leadership on this important issue. It is not very often that we have bipartisan legislation that will make a real difference in lowering healthcare costs for working families, and I am pleased to see this bill come to the House floor today.

This legislation is a no-brainer. As a physician with more than 30 years of experience, I have personally seen the need for commonsense reforms that will remove barriers to lower healthcare costs and give Americans more control over their own healthcare decisions.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, I constantly hear from families who are paying higher premiums and out-of-pocket costs for less coverage and lower quality of care. I hear from small-business owners who desperately want to help their employees acquire health insurance, but face costly regulations that make it harder, if not impossible, for them to do so.

Employers of all sizes are implementing innovative solutions to address the rising healthcare costs, and we should do everything we can to support those efforts. Unfortunately, misguided Federal rules too often stand in the way.

Regulatory guidance issued by the IRS that penalizes small businesses who offer stand-alone Health Reimbursement Arrangements is a perfect example. HRAs are popular among both workers and employers. Employers offer HRAs to help their employees pay for health care. In return, families are provided greater flexibility and an opportunity to set aside pre-tax income for medical expenses.

It simply doesn't make sense for the Federal Government to restrict a positive tool aimed at expanding access to affordable healthcare coverage. It is unconscionable that ObamaCare is penalizing small businesses for trying to do the right thing and alleviate the financial burden on working families.

That is why this bill is so important. We need to encourage policies that empower every American with affordable coverage, provide more choice, and promote a healthy workforce. And I hope we can all agree that we should eliminate misguided rules that only make it harder for families and small businesses to obtain healthcare coverage they desperately need.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation which will restore the ability of small businesses to offer HRAs.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Small Business Health Care Relief Act, and I want to thank Dr. BOUSTANY for working with me on this bill. As he pointed out, it is an important bill. It will help a lot of people, businessowners, workers, and families.

The bill that we are considering today is the result of more than a year's worth of close collaboration between stakeholders and policymakers. It is bicameral, it is bipartisan, and it is supported by dozens of small businesses and small-business organizations across the country.

Our Small Business Health Care Relief Act would allow small businesses with fewer than 50 employees, those companies that are not required to provide health care, to offer tax preferred Health Reimbursement Arrangements or HRAs. The HRAs can be used to buy health insurance in the individual market, or pay for qualified health expenses if an individual already has coverage.

Historically, small businesses offered these funds to employees in lieu of group health plans. Most of these companies don't have the capacity to offer employer-sponsored coverage, so the HRAs served as health benefits for their workers.

But right now, businesses are subject to this $100 per person per day fine that was mentioned earlier just for offering this help to their employees. This legislation clarifies that an HRA isn't a group health plan, but a means for helping individuals purchase a health plan for health services.

There is no requirement, as I mentioned, for small companies of 50 or fewer people to provide health insurance. These employers don't offer health benefits because they have to, they do it to support their workforce. We shouldn't be penalizing responsible businessowners who are going above and beyond for their employees.

Instead, we should arm small businesses with the tools that help them recruit great workers and put them on a level playing field with their larger competitors. And we should help to make sure that quality, comprehensive coverage is affordable for folks who don't have access to subsidies or employer-sponsored health care. This bill does all of that.

Small businesses drive job creation. They grow our economy. We should be going out of our way to help them support their employees and focus on what they do best, running their business.

And as was mentioned by our ranking member earlier, this is a prime example of how we should be conducting business in this House. We should be working across the aisle in a bipartisan measure. We should be building on the positive aspects of the Affordable Care Act, and this is an example of doing just that.

Again, Dr. BOUSTANY, thank you for your cooperation and your help and your good work on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, MIKE THOMPSON from California, for his collaboration. I want to thank the Ways and Means staff for working with us to get this legislation done, working with the stakeholders.

I also want to single out some of our staffers who really worked very hard on this: Melissa Gierach, Casey Badmington, and Lakecia Foster. Without their help, we could not have gotten all this put together and seen this legislation through, so I am deeply grateful for their efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense change that will expand options, it will increase portability, it will protect small businesses, and it will end these harsh penalties that small businesses were encountering as they were trying to do the right thing. So I urge my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 5447.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letters for the RECORD relating to H.R. 5447.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: I write in regard to H.R. 5447, to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements, which was referred in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee will forgo action on H.R. 5447 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 5447 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 5447 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2016.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5447, to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements. As you noted, the Committee on Energy and Commerce was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive formal consideration of H.R. 5447 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 5447, the Small Business Heath Care Relief Act. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 5447 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 5447, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. Additionally, I appreciate your committee's assistance with any additional improvements to the bill within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 5447 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2016.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5447, the ''Small Business Health Care Relief Act.'' As you noted, the Committee on Education and the Workforce was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive formal consideration of H.R. 5447 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5447, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–143)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016.

The threat constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, has not been resolved. In addition, Executive Order 13219 was amended by Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, to take additional steps with respect to acts obstructing implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement of 2001 relating to Macedonia.

Because the acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in these Executive Orders are hostile to U.S. interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 21, 2016.*

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–144)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in

scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016.

The existence and risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil U.S. Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to North Korea.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 21, 2016*.

□ 1830

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5525, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5388, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5389, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

END TAXPAYER FUNDED CELL PHONES ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5525) to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 143, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—207

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—143

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Peters
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—84

Babin
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Fattah
Fincher
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kind
Langevin
Lee
Lipinski
Lowenthal
Marchant
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott (VA)
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Trott
Velázquez
Wagner
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

□ 1851

Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. BASS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. BURGESS, AMASH, and LONG changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that the majority can schedule a vote on the no-fly, no buy bill right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain any inquiry that does not relate in a practical sense to the pending proceedings.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that that bill has been filed and it is languishing in the committee. My inquiry is, isn't it true that we can have a vote on that bill right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated an inquiry that is relevant to the proceedings before the House at this time.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the Chair answer the question posed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized. The Chair has advised that the gentleman has not stated an inquiry that is relevant to the proceedings before the House at this time.

SUPPORT FOR RAPID INNOVATION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5388) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 4, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—351

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—4

Amash
Gohmert
Jones
Massie

NOT VOTING—79

Babin
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Fattah
Fincher
Forbes
Garamendi
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kind
Langevin
Lee
Lipinski
Lowenthal
Marchant
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Napolitano
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Trott
Velázquez
Wagner
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

□ 1900

Mr. VEASEY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVERAGING EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5389) to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 8, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—347

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee

Kilmer	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin
King (IA)	Nadler	Scott, David
King (NY)	Neal	Sensenbrenner
Kinzinger (IL)	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Newhouse	Sessions
Kline	Nugent	Sewell (AL)
Knight	Nunes	Sherman
Kuster	O'Rourke	Shimkus
Labrador	Olson	Shuster
LaHood	Palazzo	Simpson
LaMalfa	Pallone	Sinema
Lamborn	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Lance	Pascrell	Smith (NE)
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Latta	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Lawrence	Perry	Stefanik
Levin	Peters	Stewart
Lewis	Peterson	Stivers
Lieu, Ted	Pittenger	Stutzman
LoBiondo	Pitts	Swalwell (CA)
Loebsack	Pocan	Takano
Lofgren	Poe (TX)	Thompson (CA)
Long	Poliquin	Thompson (MS)
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)
Love	Posey	Thornberry
Lowey	Price (NC)	Tiberi
Lucas	Price, Tom	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Quigley	Titus
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rangel	Tonko
	Ratcliffe	Torres
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Reed	Tsongas
	Reichert	Turner
Lummis	Renacci	Upton
Lynch	Ribble	Valadao
MacArthur	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (SC)	Vargas
	Richmond	Veasey
Maloney, Sean	Rigell	Vela
Marchant	Roby	Visclosky
Marino	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Walden
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
McCaul	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
McClintock	Rooney (FL)	Wasserman Schultz
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	
McDermott	Roskam	Watson Coleman
McGovern	Ross	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Rouzer	Welch
McMorris Rodgers	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
	Royce	Westerman
McNerney	Ruiz	Westmoreland
McSally	Ruppersberger	Williams
Meadows	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
Meeks	Salmon	Womack
Messer	Sarbanes	Woodall
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Yarmuth
Moolenaar	Schakowsky	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Schiff	Young (AK)
Moulton	Schrader	Young (IA)
Mullin	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)	Zeldin

NAYS—8

Amash	Grothman	Mulvaney
Duncan (TN)	Jones	Sanford
Gohmert	Massie	

NOT VOTING—79

Babin	Garamendi	Noem
Beyer	Graves (GA)	Nolan
Blumenauer	Grayson	Norcross
Bonamici	Green, Al	Paulsen
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bucshon	Hahn	Pingree
Butterfield	Hanna	Polis
Cárdenas	Harper	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Hartzler	Rush
Castro (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clawson (FL)	Higgins	
Cohen	Hill	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Hoyer	Sires
Conyers	Huelskamp	Slaughter
Courtney	Hultgren	Speier
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Takai
Crawford	Jeffries	Trott
Culberson	Kind	Velázquez
Curbelo (FL)	Langevin	Wagner
DeSantis	Lee	Walker
Duckworth	Lipinski	Walz
Duffy	Lowenthal	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	Meng	Whitfield
Ellmers (NC)	Mica	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Miller (MI)	Yoho
Fincher	Moore	Zinke
Forbes	Napolitano	

□ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall votes 334 to 336. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: Roll call 334, on H.R. 5525, vote ''nay.'' Rollcall 335, on H.R. 5388, vote ''yea.'' Rollcall 336, on H.R. 5389, vote ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, due to a weather-related flight delay, I was unavoidably detained and unable to be present to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 334, 335 and 336.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes: H.R. 5525, End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on this bill. H.R. 5388, Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on this bill. H.R. 5389, Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on this bill.

NATIVE AMERICAN HEALTH SAVINGS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5452) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5452

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Native American Health Savings Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE ASSISTANCE NOT DISQUALIFIED FROM HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE UNDER INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), an individual shall not be treated as covered under a health plan described in such subparagraph merely because the individual receives hospital care or medical services under a medical care program of the Indian Health Service or of a tribal organization.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUZER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5452, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am happy to stand before you today as we consider H.R. 5452, the Native American Health Savings Improvement Act, a bipartisan bill that makes a commonsense improvement to current rules surrounding health savings accounts and those who get care at Indian Health Services.

Generally, anyone covered solely by a high-deductible plan is allowed to make deductible contributions to a health savings account; but under IRS guidance, an individual who has received medical services at an Indian Health Service facility at any time during the previous 3 months is made ineligible from making contributions to an HSA. This practice could discourage those who rely on care that is delivered at an Indian Health Service facility from participating in an HSA. That is something that must be remedied.

High-deductible health plans and HSAs are critical components of consumer-driven health care. Together, they empower individuals and families to shop around, unleashing the powers of choice and competition to lower costs and improve quality. We want to lower barriers to these types of accounts and encourage individuals who are otherwise eligible to not forgo treatment at an Indian Health Service facility simply because of confusion over when they might be able to resume contributing to their HSAs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Currently, contributions to a health savings account may only be made when an account owner is enrolled in a high-deductible health plan. Additionally, the account owner may not be eligible for other health coverage that is not a high-deductible health plan.

This bill would make sure that receiving benefits under an Indian Health Service or a tribal medical care program does not disqualify a taxpayer from HSA eligibility. Furthermore, under this bill, the taxpayer would still have to be covered by a high-deductible health plan to be able to receive or to make HSA contributions.

It is unclear how big of a problem this currently is across the country, particularly in Indian country. I have made it clear that HSAs and high-deductible plans move our country in the wrong direction—away from affordable

and comprehensive health coverage—but I don't think individuals who are covered through IHS or tribal medical care programs should be forced to forgo one insurance or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman PAULSEN, Congresswoman NOEM, and Congressman BLUMENAUER for cosponsoring this bipartisan legislation. I also thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for his comments.

This legislation today before the House, H.R. 5452, will improve access to health savings accounts for Native Americans who choose to receive care at Indian Health Service facilities by ending an unnecessary penalty against them.

Currently, Native Americans are not allowed to contribute to their own health savings accounts for 3 months after receiving care at an Indian Health Service facility. These accounts can be a useful tool for families to cover the cost of deductibles, copayments, and coinsurance. However, current policy prevents this ability for Native Americans, and the 3-month waiting period limits their access to services that can help with treating high-risk health conditions.

This commonsense legislation eliminates the waiting period so Native Americans don't have to wait to save their hard-earned money to make their own healthcare choices and to receive treatment from Indian Health Service doctors. Today's legislation advances a bipartisan, patient-centered solution to an unfortunate, government-created problem. It will benefit all Native Americans who use HSAs, and I am glad that we can eliminate this unfair Federal penalty against them.

I thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention that Mr. BLUMENAUER wanted to be here but, because of the weather, he has just been unable to arrive. I think the majority may have the same problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would add that Representative NOEM faced a similar situation with air travel and the weather.

Mr. Speaker, about 20 million Americans are covered by a high deductible health plan with an HSA. These options are an increasingly popular option, and it is a popular option that many Native Americans would like to take advantage of. So let's come together and make sure that any current law practices that could dissuade tribal members from participation in an HSA-eligible plan would be reversed.

I urge my colleague to join me and support H.R. 5452.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5452, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT OF 2016

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5456) to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home, to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5456

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—INVESTING IN PREVENTION AND FAMILY SERVICES

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to enable States to use Federal funds available under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced support to children and families and prevent foster care placements through the provision of mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services, in-home parent skill-based programs, and kinship navigator services.

Subtitle A—Prevention Activities Under Title IV–E

SEC. 111. FOSTER CARE PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.

(a) STATE OPTION.—Section 471 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''and'' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting '', adoption assistance in accordance with section 473, and, at the option of the State, services or programs specified in subsection (e)(1) of this section for children who are candidates for foster care or who are pregnant or parenting foster youth and the parents or kin caregivers of the children, in accordance with the requirements of that subsection;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PREVENTION AND FAMILY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may make a payment to a State for providing the following services or programs for a child described

in paragraph (2) and the parents or kin caregivers of the child when the need of the child, such a parent, or such a caregiver for the services or programs are directly related to the safety, permanence, or well-being of the child or to preventing the child from entering foster care:

''(A) MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT SERVICES.—Mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services provided by a qualified clinician for not more than a 12-month period that begins on any date described in paragraph (3) with respect to the child.

''(B) IN-HOME PARENT SKILL-BASED PROGRAMS.—In-home parent skill-based programs for not more than a 12-month period that begins on any date described in paragraph (3) with respect to the child and that include parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling.

''(2) CHILD DESCRIBED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a child described in this paragraph is the following:

''(A) A child who is a candidate for foster care (as defined in section 475(13)) but can remain safely at home or in a kinship placement with receipt of services or programs specified in paragraph (1).

''(B) A child in foster care who is a pregnant or parenting foster youth.

''(3) DATE DESCRIBED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the dates described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) The date on which a child is identified in a prevention plan maintained under paragraph (4) as a child who is a candidate for foster care (as defined in section 475(13)).

''(B) The date on which a child is identified in a prevention plan maintained under paragraph (4) as a pregnant or parenting foster youth in need of services or programs specified in paragraph (1).

''(4) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO PROVIDING SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—Services and programs specified in paragraph (1) may be provided under this subsection only if specified in advance in the child's prevention plan described in subparagraph (A) and the requirements in subparagraphs (B) through (E) are met:

''(A) PREVENTION PLAN.—The State maintains a written prevention plan for the child that meets the following requirements (as applicable):

''(i) CANDIDATES.—In the case of a child who is a candidate for foster care described in paragraph (2)(A), the prevention plan shall—

''(I) identify the foster care prevention strategy for the child so that the child may remain safely at home, live temporarily with a kin caregiver until reunification can be safely achieved, or live permanently with a kin caregiver;

''(II) list the services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of the child to ensure the success of that prevention strategy; and

''(III) comply with such other requirements as the Secretary shall establish.

''(ii) PREGNANT OR PARENTING FOSTER YOUTH.—In the case of a child who is a pregnant or parenting foster youth described in paragraph (2)(B), the prevention plan shall—

''(I) be included in the child's case plan required under section 475(1);

''(II) list the services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of the youth to ensure that the youth is prepared (in the case of a pregnant foster youth) or able (in the case of a parenting foster youth) to be a parent;

''(III) describe the foster care prevention strategy for any child born to the youth; and

''(IV) comply with such other requirements as the Secretary shall establish.

''(B) TRAUMA-INFORMED.—The services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of a child are provided under an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma and in accordance with recognized principles of a trauma-informed approach and trauma-specific interventions to address trauma's consequences and facilitate healing.

''(C) ONLY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROMISING, SUPPORTED, OR WELL-SUPPORTED PRACTICES PERMITTED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Only State expenditures for services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) that are provided in accordance with practices that meet the requirements specified in clause (ii) of this subparagraph and that meet the requirements specified in clause (iii), (iv), or (v), respectively, for being a promising, supported, or well-supported practice, shall be eligible for a Federal matching payment under section 474(a)(6)(A).

''(ii) GENERAL PRACTICE REQUIREMENTS.—The general practice requirements specified in this clause are the following:

''(I) The practice has a book, manual, or other available writings that specify the components of the practice protocol and describe how to administer the practice.

''(II) There is no empirical basis suggesting that, compared to its likely benefits, the practice constitutes a risk of harm to those receiving it.

''(III) If multiple outcome studies have been conducted, the overall weight of evidence supports the benefits of the practice.

''(IV) Outcome measures are reliable and valid, and are administrated consistently and accurately across all those receiving the practice.

''(V) There is no case data suggesting a risk of harm that was probably caused by the treatment and that was severe or frequent.

''(iii) PROMISING PRACTICE.—A practice shall be considered to be a 'promising practice' if the practice is superior to an appropriate comparison practice using conventional standards of statistical significance (in terms of demonstrated meaningful improvements in validated measures of important child and parent outcomes, such as mental health, substance abuse, and child safety and well-being), as established by the results or outcomes of at least 1 study that—

''(I) was rated by an independent systematic review for the quality of the study design and execution and determined to be well-designed and well-executed; and

''(II) utilized some form of control (such as an untreated group, a placebo group, or a wait list study).

''(iv) SUPPORTED PRACTICE.—A practice shall be considered to be a 'supported practice' if—

''(I) the practice is superior to an appropriate comparison practice using conventional standards of statistical significance (in terms of demonstrated meaningful improvements in validated measures of important child and parent outcomes, such as mental health, substance abuse, and child safety and well-being), as established by the results or outcomes of at least 1 study that—

''(aa) was rated by an independent systematic review for the quality of the study design and execution and determined to be well-designed and well-executed;

''(bb) was a rigorous random-controlled trial (or, if not available, a study using a rigorous quasi-experimental research design); and

''(cc) was carried out in a usual care or practice setting; and

''(II) the study described in subclause (I) established that the practice has a sustained effect (when compared to a control group) for at least 6 months beyond the end of the treatment.

''(v) WELL-SUPPORTED PRACTICE.—A practice shall be considered to be a 'well-supported practice' if—

''(I) the practice is superior to an appropriate comparison practice using conventional standards of statistical significance (in terms of demonstrated meaningful improvements in validated measures of important child and parent outcomes, such as mental health, substance abuse, and child safety and well-being), as established by the results or outcomes of at least 2 studies that—

''(aa) were rated by an independent systematic review for the quality of the study design and execution and determined to be well-designed and well-executed;

''(bb) were rigorous random-controlled trials (or, if not available, studies using a rigorous quasi-experimental research design); and

''(cc) were carried out in a usual care or practice setting; and

''(II) at least 1 of the studies described in subclause (I) established that the practice has a sustained effect (when compared to a control group) for at least 1 year beyond the end of treatment.

''(D) GUIDANCE ON PRACTICES CRITERIA AND PRE-APPROVED SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall issue guidance to States regarding the practices criteria required for services or programs to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (C). The guidance shall include a pre-approved list of services and programs that satisfy the requirements.

''(ii) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall issue updates to the guidance required by clause (i) as often as the Secretary determines necessary.

''(E) OUTCOME ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING.—The State shall collect and report to the Secretary the following information with respect to each child for whom, or on whose behalf mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services or in-home parent skill-based programs are provided during a 12-month period beginning on the date the child is determined by the State to be a child described in paragraph (2):

''(i) The specific services or programs provided and the total expenditures for each of the services or programs.

''(ii) The duration of the services or programs provided.

''(iii) In the case of a child described in paragraph (2)(A), the child's placement status at the beginning, and at the end, of the 1-year period, respectively, and whether the child entered foster care within 2 years after being determined a candidate for foster care.

''(5) STATE PLAN COMPONENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State electing to provide services or programs specified in paragraph (1) shall submit as part of the State plan required by subsection (a) a prevention services and programs plan component that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(B) PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS PLAN COMPONENT.—In order to meet the requirements of this subparagraph, a prevention services and programs plan component, with respect to each 5-year period for which the plan component is in operation in the State, shall include the following:

''(i) How providing services and programs specified in paragraph (1) is expected to improve specific outcomes for children and families.

''(ii) How the State will monitor and oversee the safety of children who receive services and programs specified in paragraph (1), including through periodic risk assessments throughout the period in which the services and programs are provided on behalf of a child and reexamination of the prevention plan maintained for the child under paragraph (4) for the provision of the services or programs if the State determines the risk of the child entering foster care remains high despite the provision of the services or programs.

''(iii) With respect to the services and programs specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), information on the specific promising, supported, or well-supported practices the State plans to use to provide the services or programs, including a description of—

''(I) the services or programs and whether the practices used are promising, supported, or well-supported;

''(II) how the State plans to implement the services or programs, including how implementation of the services or programs will be continuously monitored to ensure fidelity to the

practice model and to determine outcomes achieved and how information learned from the monitoring will be used to refine and improve practices;

''(III) how the State selected the services or programs;

''(IV) the target population for the services or programs; and

''(V) how each service or program provided will be evaluated through a well-designed and rigorous process, which may consist of an ongoing, cross-site evaluation approved by the Secretary.

''(iv) A description of the consultation that the State agencies responsible for administering the State plans under this part and part B engage in with other State agencies responsible for administering health programs, including mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services, and with other public and private agencies with experience in administering child and family services, including community-based organizations, in order to foster a continuum of care for children described in paragraph (2) and their parents or kin caregivers.

''(v) A description of how the State shall assess children and their parents or kin caregivers to determine eligibility for services or programs specified in paragraph (1).

''(vi) A description of how the services or programs specified in paragraph (1) that are provided for or on behalf of a child and the parents or kin caregivers of the child will be coordinated with other child and family services provided to the child and the parents or kin caregivers of the child under the State plan under part B.

''(vii) Descriptions of steps the State is taking to support and enhance a competent, skilled, and professional child welfare workforce to deliver trauma-informed and evidence-based services, including—

''(I) ensuring that staff is qualified to provide services or programs that are consistent with the promising, supported, or well-supported practice models selected; and

''(II) developing appropriate prevention plans, and conducting the risk assessments required under clause (iii).

''(viii) A description of how the State will provide training and support for caseworkers in assessing what children and their families need, connecting to the families served, knowing how to access and deliver the needed trauma-informed and evidence-based services, and overseeing and evaluating the continuing appropriateness of the services.

''(ix) A description of how caseload size and type for prevention caseworkers will be determined, managed, and overseen.

''(x) An assurance that the State will report to the Secretary such information and data as the Secretary may require with respect to the provision of services and programs specified in paragraph (1), including information and data necessary to determine the performance measures for the State under paragraph (6) and compliance with paragraph (7).

''(C) REIMBURSEMENT FOR SERVICES UNDER THE PREVENTION PLAN COMPONENT.—

''(i) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subclause (ii), a State may not receive a Federal payment under this part for a given promising, supported, or well-supported practice unless (in accordance with subparagraph (B)(iii)(V)) the plan includes a well-designed and rigorous evaluation strategy for that practice.

''(ii) WAIVER OF LIMITATION.—The Secretary may waive the requirement for a well-designed and rigorous evaluation of any well-supported practice if the Secretary deems the evidence of the effectiveness of the practice to be compelling and the State meets the continuous quality improvement requirements included in subparagraph (B)(iii)(II) with regard to the practice.

''(6) PREVENTION SERVICES MEASURES.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT; ANNUAL UPDATES.—Beginning with fiscal year 2021, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall establish the following prevention services measures based on information and data reported by States that elect to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1):

''(i) PERCENTAGE OF CANDIDATES FOR FOSTER CARE WHO DO NOT ENTER FOSTER CARE.—The percentage of candidates for foster care for whom, or on whose behalf, the services or programs are provided who do not enter foster care, including those placed with a kin caregiver outside of foster care, during the 12-month period in which the services or programs are provided and through the end of the succeeding 12-month-period.

''(ii) PER-CHILD SPENDING.—The total amount of expenditures made for mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services or in-home parent skill-based programs, respectively, for, or on behalf of, each child described in paragraph (2).

''(B) DATA.—The Secretary shall establish and annually update the prevention services measures—

''(i) based on the median State values of the information reported under each clause of subparagraph (A) for the 3 then most recent years; and

''(ii) taking into account State differences in the price levels of consumption goods and services using the most recent regional price parities published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce or such other data as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(C) PUBLICATION OF STATE PREVENTION SERVICES MEASURES.—The Secretary shall annually make available to the public the prevention services measures of each State.

''(7) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT FOR STATE FOSTER CARE PREVENTION EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State elects to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the State foster care prevention expenditures for the fiscal year shall not be less than the amount of the expenditures for fiscal year 2014.

''(B) STATE FOSTER CARE PREVENTION EXPENDITURES.—The term 'State foster care prevention expenditures' means the following:

''(i) TANF; IV–B; SSBG.—State expenditures for foster care prevention services and activities under the State program funded under part A (including from amounts made available by the Federal Government), under the State plan developed under part B (including any such amounts), or under the Social Services Block Grant Programs under subtitle A of title XX (including any such amounts).

''(ii) OTHER STATE PROGRAMS.—State expenditures for foster care prevention services and activities under any State program that is not described in clause (i) (other than any State expenditures for foster care prevention services and activities under the State program under this part (including under a waiver of the program)).

''(C) STATE EXPENDITURES.—The term 'State expenditures' means all State or local funds that are expended by the State or a local agency including State or local funds that are matched or reimbursed by the Federal Government and State or local funds that are not matched or reimbursed by the Federal Government.

''(D) DETERMINATION OF PREVENTION SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall require each State that elects to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1) to report the expenditures specified in subparagraph (B) for fiscal year 2014 and for such fiscal years thereafter as are necessary to determine whether the State is complying with the maintenance of effort requirement in subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall specify the specific services and activities under each program referred to in subparagraph (B) that are 'prevention services and activities' for purposes of the reports.

''(8) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF STATE FOSTER CARE PREVENTION EXPENDITURES AND FEDERAL IV–E PREVENTION FUNDS FOR MATCHING OR EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENT.—A State that elects to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1) shall not use any State foster care prevention expenditures for a fiscal year for the State share of expenditures under section 474(a)(6) for a fiscal year.

''(9) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Expenditures described in section 474(a)(6)(B)—

''(A) shall not be eligible for payment under subparagraph (A), (B), or (E) of section 474(a)(3); and

''(B) shall be eligible for payment under section 474(a)(6)(B) without regard to whether the expenditures are incurred on behalf of a child who is, or is potentially, eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this part.

''(10) APPLICATION.—The provision of services or programs under this subsection to or on behalf of a child described in paragraph (2) shall not be considered to be receipt of aid or assistance under the State plan under this part for purposes of eligibility for any other program established under this Act.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 475 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) The term 'child who is a candidate for foster care' means, a child who is identified in a prevention plan under section 471(e)(4)(A) as being at imminent risk of entering foster care (without regard to whether the child would be eligible for foster care maintenance payments under section 472 or is or would be eligible for adoption assistance or kinship guardianship assistance payments under section 473) but who can remain safely in the child's home or in a kinship placement as long as services or programs specified in section 471(e)(1) that are necessary to prevent the entry of the child into foster care are provided. The term includes a child whose adoption or guardianship arrangement is at risk of a disruption or dissolution that would result in a foster care placement.''.

(c) PAYMENTS UNDER TITLE IV–E.—Section 474(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; plus''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) subject to section 471(e)—

''(A) for each quarter—

''(i) subject to clause (ii)—

''(I) beginning after September 30, 2019, and before October 1, 2025, an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount expended during the quarter for the provision of services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 471(e)(1) that are provided in accordance with promising, supported, or well-supported practices that meet the applicable criteria specified for the practices in section 471(e)(4)(C); and

''(II) beginning after September 30, 2025, an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage (which shall be as defined in section 1905(b), in the case of a State other than the District of Columbia, or 70 percent, in the case of the District of Columbia) of the total amount expended during the quarter for the provision of services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 471(e)(1) that are provided in accordance with promising, supported, or well-supported practices that meet the applicable criteria specified for the practices in section 471(e)(4)(C) (or, with respect to the payments made during the quarter under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into by the State and an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium for the administration or payment of funds under this part, an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage that would apply under section 479B(d) (in this paragraph referred to as the 'tribal FMAP') if the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium made the payments under a program operated under that section, unless the tribal FMAP is less than the Federal medical assistance percentage that applies to the State); except that

''(ii) not less than 50 percent of the total amount payable to a State under clause (i) for a fiscal year shall be for the provision of services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 471(e)(1) that are provided in accordance with well-supported practices; plus

''(B) for each quarter specified in subparagraph (A), an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amount expended during the quarter:

''(i) 50 percent of so much of the expenditures as are found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan for the provision of services or programs specified in section 471(e)(1), including expenditures for activities approved by the Secretary that promote the development of necessary processes and procedures to establish and implement the provision of the services and programs for individuals who are eligible for the services and programs and expenditures attributable to data collection and reporting; and

''(ii) 50 percent of so much of the expenditures with respect to the provision of services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1) as are for training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision and of the members of the staff of State-licensed or State-approved child welfare agencies providing services to children described in section 471(e)(2) and their parents or kin caregivers, including on how to determine who are individuals eligible for the services or programs, how to identify and provide appropriate services and programs, and how to oversee and evaluate the ongoing appropriateness of the services and programs.''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BEST PRACTICES, CLEARINGHOUSE, AND DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATIONS.—Section 476 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 676) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BEST PRACTICES, CLEARINGHOUSE, DATA COLLECTION, AND EVALUATIONS RELATING TO PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—

''(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall provide to States and, as applicable, to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal consortia, technical assistance regarding the provision of services and programs described in section 471(e)(1) and shall disseminate best practices with respect to the provision of the services and programs, including how to plan and implement a well-designed and rigorous evaluation of a promising, supported, or well-supported practice.

''(2) CLEARINGHOUSE OF PROMISING, SUPPORTED, AND WELL-SUPPORTED PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall, directly or through grants, contracts, or interagency agreements, evaluate research on the practices specified in clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively, of section 471(e)(4)(C), and programs that meet the requirements described in section 427(a)(1), including culturally specific, or location- or population-based adaptations of the practices, to identify and establish a public clearinghouse of the practices that satisfy each category described by such clauses. In addition, the clearinghouse shall include information on the specific outcomes associated with each practice, including whether the practice has been shown to prevent child abuse and neglect and reduce the likelihood of foster care placement by supporting birth families and kinship families and improving targeted supports for pregnant and parenting youth and their children.

''(3) DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary, directly or through grants, contracts, or interagency agreements, may collect data and conduct evaluations with respect to the provision of services and programs described in section 471(e)(1) for purposes of assessing the extent to which the provision of the services and programs—

''(A) reduces the likelihood of foster care placement;

''(B) increases use of kinship care arrangements; or

''(C) improves child well-being.

''(4) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives periodic reports based on the provision of services and programs described in section 471(e)(1) and the activities carried out under this subsection.

''(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the reports to Congress submitted under this paragraph publicly available.

''(5) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter to carry out this subsection.''.

(e) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 479B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)(i)—

(I) in subclause (II), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(II) in subclause (III), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) at the option of the tribe, organization, or consortium, services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1) to children described in section 471(e)(2) and their parents or kin caregivers, in accordance with section 471(e) and subparagraph (E).''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND THEIR PARENTS AND KIN CAREGIVERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a tribe, organization, or consortium that elects to provide services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1) to children described in section 471(e)(2) and their parents or kin caregivers under the plan, the Secretary shall specify the requirements applicable to the provision of the services and programs. The requirements shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be consistent with the requirements applicable to States under section 471(e) and shall permit the provision of the services and programs in the form of services and programs that are adapted to the culture and context of the tribal communities served.

''(ii) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish specific performance measures for each tribe, organization, or consortium that elects to provide services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1). The performance measures shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be consistent with the prevention services measures required for States under section 471(e)(6) but shall allow for consideration of factors unique to the provision of the services by tribes, organizations, or consortia.''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''and (5)'' and inserting ''(5), and (6)(A)''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for subsection (d) of section 479B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679c) is amended by striking ''FOR FOSTER CARE MAINTENANCE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS''.

SEC. 112. FOSTER CARE MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS FOR CHILDREN WITH PARENTS IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by striking ''or'' and inserting '', with a parent residing in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility, but only to the extent permitted under subsection (j), or in a''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) CHILDREN PLACED WITH A PARENT RESIDING IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a child who is eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this section, or who would be eligible for the payments if the eligibility were determined without regard to paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a), shall be eligible for the payments for a period of not more than 12 months during which the child is placed with a parent who is in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse, but only if—

''(A) the recommendation for the placement is specified in the child's case plan before the placement;

''(B) the treatment facility provides, as part of the treatment for substance abuse, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling; and

''(C) the substance abuse treatment, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling is provided under an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma and in accordance with recognized principles of a trauma-informed approach and trauma-specific interventions to address the consequences of trauma and facilitate healing.

''(2) APPLICATION.—With respect to children for whom foster care maintenance payments are made under paragraph (1), only the children who satisfy the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a) shall be considered to be children with respect to whom foster care maintenance payments are made under this section for purposes of subsection (h) or section 473(b)(3)(B).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(1)) is amended by inserting ''subject to section 472(j),'' before ''an amount equal to the Federal'' the 1st place it appears.

SEC. 113. TITLE IV–E PAYMENTS FOR EVIDENCE-BASED KINSHIP NAVIGATOR PROGRAMS.

Section 474(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)), as amended by section 111(c), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; plus''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) an amount equal to 50 percent of the amounts expended by the State during the quarter as the Secretary determines are for kinship navigator programs that meet the requirements described in section 427(a)(1) and that the Secretary determines are operated in accordance with promising, supported, or well-supported practices that meet the applicable criteria specified for the practices in section 471(e)(4)(C), without regard to whether the expenditures are incurred on behalf of children who are, or are potentially, eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this part.''.

Subtitle B—Enhanced Support Under Title IV–B

SEC. 121. ELIMINATION OF TIME LIMIT FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES WHILE IN FOSTER CARE AND PERMITTING TIME-LIMITED FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES WHEN A CHILD RETURNS HOME FROM FOSTER CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 431(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''TIME-LIMITED FAMILY'' and inserting ''FAMILY''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''time-limited family'' and inserting ''family'';

(B) by inserting ''or a child who has been returned home'' after ''child care institution''; and

(C) by striking '', but only during the 15-month period that begins on the date that the child, pursuant to section 475(5)(F), is considered to have entered foster care'' and inserting

''and to ensure the strength and stability of the reunification. In the case of a child who has been returned home, the services and activities shall only be provided during the 15-month period that begins on the date that the child returns home''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 430 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''time-limited''.

(2) Subsections (a)(4), (a)(5)(A), and (b)(1) of section 432 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629b) are amended by striking ''time-limited'' each place it appears.

SEC. 122. REDUCING BUREAUCRACY AND UNNECESSARY DELAYS WHEN PLACING CHILDREN IN HOMES ACROSS STATE LINES.

(a) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(25)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''provide'' and insert ''provides''; and

(2) by inserting '', which, not later than October 1, 2026, shall include the use of an electronic interstate case-processing system'' before the 1st semicolon.

(b) GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.—Section 437 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to facilitate the development of an electronic interstate case-processing system for the exchange of data and documents to expedite the placements of children in foster, guardianship, or adoptive homes across State lines.

''(2) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—A State that desires a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary an application containing the following:

''(A) A description of the goals and outcomes to be achieved during the period for which grant funds are sought, which goals and outcomes must result in—

''(i) reducing the time it takes for a child to be provided with a safe and appropriate permanent living arrangement across State lines;

''(ii) improving administrative processes and reducing costs in the foster care system; and

''(iii) the secure exchange of relevant case files and other necessary materials in real time, and timely communications and placement decisions regarding interstate placements of children.

''(B) A description of the activities to be funded in whole or in part with the grant funds, including the sequencing of the activities.

''(C) A description of the strategies for integrating programs and services for children who are placed across State lines.

''(D) Such other information as the Secretary may require.

''(3) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make a grant to a State that complies with paragraph (2).

''(4) USE OF FUNDS.—A State to which a grant is made under this subsection shall use the grant to support the State in connecting with the electronic interstate case-processing system described in paragraph (1).

''(5) EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the final year in which grants are awarded under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress, and make available to the general public by posting on a website, a report that contains the following information:

''(A) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) has changed the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

''(B) The number of cases subject to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children that were processed through the electronic interstate case-processing system, and the number of interstate child placement cases that were processed outside the electronic interstate case-processing system, by each State in each year.

''(C) The progress made by States in implementing the electronic interstate case-processing system.

''(D) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected various metrics related to child safety and well-being, including the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

''(E) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected administrative costs and caseworker time spent on placing children across State lines.

''(6) DATA INTEGRATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretariat for the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children and the States, shall assess how the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) could be used to better serve and protect children that come to the attention of the child welfare system, by—

''(A) connecting the system with other data systems (such as systems operated by State law enforcement and judicial agencies, systems operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purposes of the Innocence Lost National Initiative, and other systems);

''(B) simplifying and improving reporting related to paragraphs (34) and (35) of section 471(a) regarding children or youth who have been identified as being a sex trafficking victim or children missing from foster care; and

''(C) improving the ability of States to quickly comply with background check requirements of section 471(a)(20), including checks of child abuse and neglect registries as required by section 471(a)(20)(B).''.

(c) RESERVATION OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.—Section 437(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) IMPROVING THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall reserve $5,000,000 of the amount made available for fiscal year 2017 for grants under subsection (g), and the amount so reserved shall remain available through fiscal year 2021.''.

SEC. 123. ENHANCEMENTS TO GRANTS TO IMPROVE WELL-BEING OF FAMILIES AFFECTED BY SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

Section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''INCREASE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND TO IMPROVE THE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AFFECTED BY'' and inserting ''IMPLEMENT IV-E PREVENTION SERVICES, AND IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND IMPROVE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY HEROIN, OPIOIDS, AND OTHER'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'regional partnership' means a collaborative agreement (which may be established on an interstate, State, or intrastate basis) entered into by the following:

''(A) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR ALL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—

''(i) The State child welfare agency that is responsible for the administration of the State plan under this part and part E.

''(ii) The State agency responsible for administering the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant provided under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act.

''(B) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROPOSING TO SERVE CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS.—If the partnership proposes to serve children in out-of-home placements, the Juvenile Court or Administrative Office of the Court that is most appropriate to oversee the administration of court programs in the region to address the population of families who come to the attention of the court due to child abuse or neglect.

''(C) OPTIONAL PARTNERS.—At the option of the partnership, any of the following:

''(i) An Indian tribe or tribal consortium.

''(ii) Nonprofit child welfare service providers.

''(iii) For-profit child welfare service providers.

''(iv) Community health service providers, including substance abuse treatment providers.

''(v) Community mental health providers.

''(vi) Local law enforcement agencies.

''(vii) School personnel.

''(viii) Tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortia of the agencies).

''(ix) Any other providers, agencies, personnel, officials, or entities that are related to the provision of child and family services under a State plan approved under this subpart.

''(D) EXCEPTION FOR REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS WHERE THE LEAD APPLICANT IS AN INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL CONSORTIA.—If an Indian tribe or tribal consortium enters into a regional partnership for purposes of this subsection, the Indian tribe or tribal consortium—

''(i) may (but is not required to) include the State child welfare agency as a partner in the collaborative agreement;

''(ii) may not enter into a collaborative agreement only with tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortium of the agencies); and

''(iii) if the condition described in paragraph (2)(B) applies, may include tribal court organizations in lieu of other judicial partners.'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''; and

(ii) by striking ''$500,000 and not more than $1,000,000'' and inserting ''$250,000 and not more than $1,000,000'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting ''; PLANNING'' after ''APPROVAL'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''clause (ii)'' and inserting ''clauses (ii) and (iii)''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) SUFFICIENT PLANNING.—A grant awarded under this subsection shall be disbursed in 2 phases: a planning phase (not to exceed 2 years); and an implementation phase. The total disbursement to a grantee for the planning phase may not exceed $250,000, and may not exceed the total anticipated funding for the implementation phase.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT FOR A FISCAL YEAR.—No payment shall be made under subparagraph (A) or (C) for a fiscal year until the Secretary determines that the eligible partnership has made sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the grant and that the members of the eligible partnership are coordinating to a reasonable degree with the other members of the eligible partnership.'';

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting '', parents, and families'' after ''children'';

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking ''safety and permanence for such children; and'' and inserting ''safe, permanent caregiving relationships for the children;'';

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking ''or'' and inserting ''increase reunification rates for children who have been placed in out of home care, or decrease''; and

(iv) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (v) and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) improve the substance abuse treatment outcomes for parents including retention in treatment and successful completion of treatment;

''(iv) facilitate the implementation, delivery, and effectiveness of prevention services and programs under section 471(e); and'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''where appropriate,''; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) and inserting the following:

''(E) A description of a plan for sustaining the services provided by or activities funded under the grant after the conclusion of the grant period, including through the use of prevention services and programs under section 471(e) and other funds provided to the State for child welfare and substance abuse prevention and treatment services.

''(F) Additional information needed by the Secretary to determine that the proposed activities and implementation will be consistent with research or evaluations showing which practices and approaches are most effective.'';

(5) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking ''abuse treatment'' and inserting ''use disorder treatment including medication assisted treatment and in-home substance abuse disorder treatment and recovery'';

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) demonstrate a track record of successful collaboration among child welfare, substance abuse disorder treatment and mental health agencies; and'';

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''establish indicators that will be'' and inserting ''review indicators that are''; and

(ii) by striking ''in using funds made available under such grants to achieve the purpose of this subsection'' and inserting ''and establish a set of core indicators related to child safety, parental recovery, parenting capacity, and family well-being. In developing the core indicators, to the extent possible, indicators shall be made consistent with the outcome measures described in section 471(e)(6)'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''base the performance measures on lessons learned from prior rounds of regional partnership grants under this subsection, and'' before ''consult''; and

(ii) by striking clauses (iii) and (iv) and inserting the following:

''(iii) Other stakeholders or constituencies as determined by the Secretary.'';

(8) in paragraph (9)(A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than September 30 of each fiscal year in which a recipient of a grant under this subsection is paid funds under the grant, and every 6 months thereafter, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report on the services provided and activities carried out during the reporting period, progress made in achieving the goals of the program, the number of children, adults, and families receiving services, and such additional information as the Secretary determines is necessary. The report due not later than September 30 of the last such fiscal year shall include, at a minimum, data on each of the performance indicators included in the evaluation of the regional partnership.''; and

(9) in paragraph (10), by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 131. REVIEWING AND IMPROVING LICENSING STANDARDS FOR PLACEMENT IN A RELATIVE FOSTER FAMILY HOME.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF REPUTABLE MODEL LICENSING STANDARDS.—Not later than October 1, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall identify reputable model licensing standards with respect to the licensing of foster family homes (as defined in section 472(c)(1) of the Social Security Act).

(b) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (34)(B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (35)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(36) provides that, not later than April 1, 2018, the State shall submit to the Secretary information addressing—

''(A) whether the State licensing standards are in accord with model standards identified by the Secretary, and if not, the reason for the specific deviation and a description as to why having a standard that is reasonably in accord with the corresponding national model standards is not appropriate for the State;

''(B) whether the State has elected to waive standards established in 471(a)(10)(A) for relative foster family homes (pursuant to waiver authority provided by 471(a)(10)(D)), a description of which standards the State most commonly waives, and if the State has not elected to waive the standards, the reason for not waiving these standards;

''(C) if the State has elected to waive standards specified in subparagraph (B), how caseworkers are trained to use the waiver authority and whether the State has developed a process or provided tools to assist caseworkers in waiving nonsafety standards per the authority provided in 471(a)(10)(D) to quickly place children with relatives; and

''(D) a description of the steps the State is taking to improve caseworker training or the process, if any; and''.

SEC. 132. DEVELOPMENT OF A STATEWIDE PLAN TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT FATALITIES.

Section 422(b)(19) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(19)) is amended to read as follows:

''(19) document steps taken to track and prevent child maltreatment deaths by including—

''(A) a description of the steps the State is taking to compile complete and accurate information on the deaths required by Federal law to be reported by the State agency referred to in paragraph (1), including gathering relevant information on the deaths from the relevant organizations in the State including entities such as State vital statistics department, child death review teams, law enforcement agencies, offices of medical examiners or coroners; and

''(B) a description of the steps the state is taking to develop and implement of a comprehensive, statewide plan to prevent the fatalities that involves and engages relevant public and private agency partners, including those in public health, law enforcement, and the courts.''.

SEC. 133. MODERNIZING THE TITLE AND PURPOSE OF TITLE IV–E.

(a) PART HEADING.—The heading for part E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''PART E—FEDERAL PAYMENTS FOR FOSTER CARE, PREVENTION, AND PERMANENCY''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The 1st sentence of section 470 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 670) is amended—

(1) by striking ''1995) and'' and inserting ''1995),'';

(2) by inserting ''kinship guardianship assistance, and prevention services or programs specified in section 471(e)(1),'' after ''needs,''; and

(3) by striking ''(commencing with the fiscal year which begins October 1, 1980)''.

SEC. 134. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The amendments made by sections 131 and 133 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State plan under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(2) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires time to take action necessary to comply with the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title (whether the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium has a plan under section 479B of the Social Security Act or a cooperative agreement or contract entered into with a State), the Secretary shall provide the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium with such additional time as the Secretary determines is necessary for the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium to take the action to comply with the additional requirements before being regarded as failing to comply with the requirements.

TITLE II—ENSURING THE NECESSITY OF A PLACEMENT THAT IS NOT IN A FOSTER FAMILY HOME

SEC. 201. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR PLACEMENTS THAT ARE NOT IN FOSTER FAMILY HOMES.

(a) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672), as amended by section 112, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by inserting '', but only to the extent permitted under subsection (k)'' after ''institution''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(k) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the third week for which foster care maintenance payments are made under this section on behalf of a child placed in a child-care institution, no Federal payment shall be made to the State under section 474(a)(1) for amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of the child unless—

''(A) the child is placed in a child-care institution that is a setting specified in paragraph (2) (or is placed in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility consistent with subsection (j)); and

''(B) in the case of a child placed in a qualified residential treatment program (as defined in paragraph (4)), the requirements specified in paragraph (3) and section 475A(c) are met.

''(2) SPECIFIED SETTINGS FOR PLACEMENT.—The settings for placement specified in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) A qualified residential treatment program (as defined in paragraph (4)).

''(B) A setting specializing in providing prenatal, post-partum, or parenting supports for youth.

''(C) In the case of a child who has attained 18 years of age, a supervised setting in which the child is living independently.

''(3) ASSESSMENT TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF PLACEMENT IN A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.—

''(A) DEADLINE FOR ASSESSMENT.—In the case of a child who is placed in a qualified residential treatment program, if the assessment required under section 475A(c)(1) is not completed within 30 days after the placement is made, no Federal payment shall be made to the State under section 474(a)(1) for any amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of the child during the placement.

''(B) DEADLINE FOR TRANSITION OUT OF PLACEMENT.—If the assessment required under section 475A(c)(1) determines that the placement of a child in a qualified residential treatment program is not appropriate, a court disapproves such a placement under section 475A(c)(2), or a child who has been in an approved placement in a qualified residential treatment program is going to return home or be placed with a fit and willing relative, a legal guardian, or an adoptive parent, or in a foster family home, Federal payments shall be made to the State under section 474(a)(1) for amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of the child while the child remains in the qualified residential treatment program only during the period necessary for the child to transition home or to such a placement. In no event shall a State receive Federal payments under section 474(a)(1) for amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of a child who remains placed in a qualified residential treatment program after the end of the 30-day period that begins on the date a determination is made that the placement is no longer the recommended or approved placement for the child.

''(4) QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.—For purposes of this part, the term 'qualified residential treatment program' means a program that—

''(A) has a trauma-informed treatment model that is designed to address the needs, including clinical needs as appropriate, of children with serious emotional or behavioral disorders or disturbances and, with respect to a child, is able to implement the treatment identified for the child by the assessment of the child required under section 475A(c);

''(B) has registered or licensed nursing staff and other licensed clinical staff who—

''(i) provide care within the scope of their practice as defined by State law;

''(ii) are on-site during business hours; and

''(iii) are available 24 hours a day and 7 days a week;

''(C) to extent appropriate, and in accordance with the child's best interests, facilitates participation of family members in the child's treatment program;

''(D) facilitates outreach to the family members of the child, including siblings, documents how the outreach is made (including contact information), and maintains contact information for any known biological family and fictive kin of the child;

''(E) documents how family members are integrated into the treatment process for the child, including post-discharge, and how sibling connections are maintained;

''(F) provides discharge planning and family-based aftercare support for at least 6 months post-discharge; and

''(G) is licensed in accordance with section 471(a)(10) and is accredited by any of the following independent, not-for-profit organizations:

''(i) The Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF).

''(ii) The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO).

''(iii) The Council on Accreditation (COA).

''(iv) Any other independent, not-for-profit accrediting organization approved by the Secretary.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(1)), as amended by section 112(b), is amended by striking ''section 472(j)'' and inserting ''subsections (j) and (k) of section 472''.

(b) DEFINITION OF FOSTER FAMILY HOME, CHILD-CARE INSTITUTION.—Section 472(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 672(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this part:

''(1) FOSTER FAMILY HOME.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'foster family home' means the home of an individual or family—

''(i) that is licensed or approved by the State in which it is situated as a foster family home that meets the standards established for the licensing or approval; and

''(ii) in which a child in foster care has been placed in the care of an individual, who resides with the child and who has been licensed or approved by the State to be a foster parent—

''(I) that the State deems capable of adhering to the reasonable and prudent parent standard;

''(II) that provides 24-hour substitute care for children placed away from their parents or other caretakers; and

''(III) that provides the care for not more than 6 children in foster care.

''(B) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—The number of foster children that may be cared for in a home under subparagraph (A) may exceed the numerical limitation in subparagraph (A)(ii)(III), at the option of the State, for any of the following reasons:

''(i) To allow a parenting youth in foster care to remain with the child of the parenting youth.

''(ii) To allow siblings to remain together.

''(iii) To allow a child with an established meaningful relationship with the family to remain with the family.

''(iv) To allow a family with special training or skills to provide care to a child who has a severe disability.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as prohibiting a foster parent from renting the home in which the parent cares for a foster child placed in the parent's care.

''(2) CHILD-CARE INSTITUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'child-care institution' means a private child-care institution, or a public child-care institution which accommodates no more than 25 children, which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved by the agency of the State responsible for licensing or approval of institutions of this type as meeting the standards established for the licensing.

''(B) SUPERVISED SETTINGS.—In the case of a child who has attained 18 years of age, the term shall include a supervised setting in which the individual is living independently, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary shall establish in regulations.

''(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term shall not include detention facilities, forestry camps, training schools, or any other facility operated primarily for the detention of children who are determined to be delinquent.''.

(c) TRAINING FOR STATE JUDGES, ATTORNEYS, AND OTHER LEGAL PERSONNEL IN CHILD WELFARE CASES.—Section 438(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(b)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting ''shall provide for the training of judges, attorneys, and other legal personnel in child welfare cases on Federal child welfare policies and payment limitations with respect to children in foster care who are placed in settings that are not a foster family home,'' after ''with respect to the child,''.

(d) ASSURANCE OF NONIMPACT ON JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.—

(1) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)), as amended by section 131, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(37) includes a certification that, in response to the limitation imposed under section 472(k) with respect to foster care maintenance payments made on behalf of any child who is placed in a setting that is not a foster family home, the State will not enact or advance policies or practices that would result in a significant increase in the population of youth in the State's juvenile justice system.''.

(2) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the impact, if any, on State juvenile justice systems of the limitation imposed under section 472(k) of the Social Security Act (as added by section 201(a)(1)) on foster care maintenance payments made on behalf of any child who is placed in a setting that is not a foster family home, in accordance with the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section. In particular, the Comptroller General shall evaluate the extent to which children in foster care who also are subject to the juvenile justice system of the State are placed in a facility under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system and whether the lack of available congregate care placements under the jurisdiction of the child welfare systems is a contributing factor to that result. Not later than December 31, 2023, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

SEC. 202. ASSESSMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF THE NEED FOR PLACEMENT IN A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.

Section 475A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ASSESSMENT, DOCUMENTATION, AND JUDICIAL DETERMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT IN A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.—In the case of any child who is placed in a qualified residential treatment program (as defined in section 472(k)(4)), the following requirements shall apply for purposes of approving the case plan for the child and the case system review procedure for the child:

''(1)(A) Within 30 days of the start of each placement in such a setting, a qualified individual (as defined in subparagraph (D)) shall—

''(i) assess the strengths and needs of the child using an age-appropriate, evidence-based, validated, functional assessment tool approved by the Secretary;

''(ii) determine whether the needs of the child can be met with family members or through placement in a foster family home or, if not, which setting from among the settings specified in section 472(k)(2) would provide the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child in the least restrictive environment and be consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child; and

''(iii) develop a list of child-specific short- and long-term mental and behavioral health goals.

''(B)(i) The State shall assemble a family and permanency team for the child in accordance with the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii). The qualified individual conducting the assessment required under subparagraph (A) shall work in conjunction with the family of, and permanency team for, the child while conducting and making the assessment.

''(ii) The family and permanency team shall consist of all appropriate biological family members, relative, and fictive kin of the child, as well as, as appropriate, professionals who are a resource to the family of the child, such as teachers, medical or mental health providers who have treated the child, or clergy. In the case of a child who has attained age 14, the family and permanency team shall include the members of the permanency planning team for the child that are selected by the child in accordance with section 475(5)(C)(iv).

''(iii) The State shall document in the child's case plan—

''(I) the reasonable and good faith effort of the State to identify and include all such individuals on the family of, and permanency team for, the child;

''(II) all contact information for members of the family and permanency team, as well as

''contact information for other family members and fictive kin who are not part of the family and permanency team;

''(III) evidence that meetings of the family and permanency team, including meetings relating to the assessment required under subparagraph (A), are held at a time and place convenient for family;

''(IV) if reunification is the goal, evidence demonstrating that the parent from whom the child was removed provided input on the members of the family and permanency team;

''(V) evidence that the assessment required under subparagraph (A) is determined in conjunction with the family and permanency team; and

''(VI) the placement preferences of the family and permanency team relative to the assessment and, if the placement preferences of the family and permanency team and child are not the placement setting recommended by the qualified individual conducting the assessment under subparagraph (A), the reasons why the preferences of the team and of the child were not recommended.

''(C) In the case of a child who the qualified individual conducting the assessment under subparagraph (A) determines should not be placed in a foster family home, the qualified individual shall specify in writing the reasons why the needs of the child cannot be met by the family of the child or in a foster family home. A shortage or lack of foster family homes shall not be an acceptable reason for determining that a needs of the child cannot be met in a foster family home. The qualified individual also shall specify in writing why the recommended placement in a qualified residential treatment program is the setting that will provide the child with the most effective and appropriate level of care in the least restrictive environment and how that placement is consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child.

''(D)(i) Subject to clause (ii), in this subsection, the term 'qualified individual' means a trained professional or licensed clinician who is not an employee of the State agency and who is not connected to, or affiliated with, any placement setting in which children are placed by the State.

''(ii) The Secretary may approve a request of a State to waive any requirement in clause (i) upon a submission by the State, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, that certifies that the trained professionals or licensed clinicians with responsibility for performing the assessments described in subparagraph (A) shall maintain objectivity with respect to determining the most effective and appropriate placement for a child.

''(2) Within 60 days of the start of each placement in a qualified residential treatment program, a family or juvenile court or another court (including a tribal court) of competent jurisdiction, or an administrative body appointed or approved by the court, independently, shall—

''(A) consider the assessment, determination, and documentation made by the qualified individual conducting the assessment under paragraph (1);

''(B) determine whether the needs of the child can be met through placement in a foster family home or, if not, whether placement of the child in a qualified residential treatment program provides the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child in the least restrictive environment and whether that placement is consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child; and

''(C) approve or disapprove the placement.

''(3) The written documentation made under paragraph (1)(C) and documentation of the determination and approval or disapproval of the placement in a qualified residential treatment program by a court or administrative body under paragraph (2) shall be included in and made part of the case plan for the child.

''(4) As long as a child remains placed in a qualified residential treatment program, the State agency shall submit evidence at each status review and each permanency hearing held with respect to the child—

''(A) demonstrating that ongoing assessment of the strengths and needs of the child continues to support the determination that the needs of the child cannot be met through placement in a foster family home, that the placement in a qualified residential treatment program provides the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child in the least restrictive environment, and that the placement is consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child;

''(B) documenting the specific treatment or service needs that will be met for the child in the placement and the length of time the child is expected to need the treatment or services; and

''(C) documenting the efforts made by the State agency to prepare the child to return home or to be placed with a fit and willing relative, a legal guardian, or an adoptive parent, or in a foster family home.

''(5) In the case of any child who is placed in a qualified residential treatment program for more than 12 consecutive months or 18 nonconsecutive months (or, in the case of a child who has not attained age 13, for more than 6 consecutive or nonconsecutive months), the State agency shall submit to the Secretary—

''(A) the most recent versions of the evidence and documentation specified in paragraph (4); and

''(B) the signed approval of the head of the State agency for the continued placement of the child in that setting.''.

SEC. 203. PROTOCOLS TO PREVENT INAPPROPRIATE DIAGNOSES.

(a) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 422(b)(15)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(15)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vi), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (viii); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

''(vii) the procedures and protocols the State has established to ensure that children in foster care placements are not inappropriately diagnosed with mental illness, other emotional or behavioral disorders, medically fragile conditions, or developmental disabilities, and placed in settings that are not foster family homes as a result of the inappropriate diagnoses; and''.

(b) EVALUATION.—Section 476 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 676), as amended by section 111(d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) EVALUATION OF STATE PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS TO PREVENT INAPPROPRIATE DIAGNOSES OF MENTAL ILLNESS OR OTHER CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the procedures and protocols established by States in accordance with the requirements of section 422(b)(15)(A)(vii). The evaluation shall analyze the extent to which States comply with and enforce the procedures and protocols and the effectiveness of various State procedures and protocols and shall identify best practices. Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of the evaluation to Congress.''.

SEC. 204. ADDITIONAL DATA AND REPORTS REGARDING CHILDREN PLACED IN A SETTING THAT IS NOT A FOSTER FAMILY HOME.

Section 479A(a)(7)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 679b(a)(7)(A)) is amended by striking clauses (i) through (vi) and inserting the following:

''(i) with respect to each such placement—

''(I) the type of the placement setting, including whether the placement is shelter care, a group home and if so, the range of the child population in the home, a residential treatment facility, a hospital or institution providing medical, rehabilitative, or psychiatric care, a setting specializing in providing prenatal, post-partum or parenting supports, or some other kind of child-care institution and if so, what kind;

''(II) the number of children in the placement setting and the age, race, ethnicity, and gender of each of the children;

''(III) for each child in the placement setting, the length of the placement of the child in the setting, whether the placement of the child in the setting is the first placement of the child and if not, the number and type of previous placements of the child, and whether the child has special needs or another diagnosed mental or physical illness or condition; and

''(IV) the extent of any specialized education, treatment, counseling, or other services provided in the setting; and

''(ii) separately, the number and ages of children in the placements who have a permanency plan of another planned permanent living arrangement; and''.

SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATES; APPLICATION TO WAIVERS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsections (b) and (c), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—In the case of a State plan under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet the additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(b) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR PLACEMENTS THAT ARE NOT IN FOSTER FAMILY HOMES AND RELATED PROVISIONS.—The amendments made by sections 201(a), 201(b), 201(d), and 202 shall take effect on October 1, 2019.

(c) APPLICATION TO STATES WITH WAIVERS.—In the case of a State that, on the date of enactment of this Act, has in effect a waiver approved under section 1130 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-9), the amendments made by this title shall not apply with respect to the State before the expiration (determined without regard to any extensions) of the waiver to the extent the amendments are inconsistent with the terms of the waiver.

TITLE III—CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

SEC. 301. SUPPORTING AND RETAINING FOSTER FAMILIES FOR CHILDREN.

(a) SUPPORTING AND RETAINING FOSTER PARENTS AS A FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICE.—Section 431(a)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 631(a)(2)(B)) is amended by redesignating clauses (iii) through (vi) as clauses (iv) through (vii), respectively, and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) To support and retain foster families so they can provide quality family-based settings for children in foster care.''.

(b) SUPPORT FOR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES.—Section 436 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SUPPORT FOR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 2018, $8,000,000 for the Secretary to make competitive grants to States, Indian tribes, or tribal consortia to support the recruitment and retention

of high-quality foster families to increase their capacity to place more children in family settings, focused on States, Indian tribes, or tribal consortia with the highest percentage of children in non-family settings. The amount appropriated under this subparagraph shall remain available through fiscal year 2022.''.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 425 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 625) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(b) EXTENSION OF PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 436(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(a)) is amended by striking all that follows ''$345,000,000'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021.''.

(2) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—Section 437(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(a)) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(c) EXTENSION OF FUNDING RESERVATIONS FOR MONTHLY CASEWORKER VISITS AND REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 436(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(d) REAUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR STATE COURTS.—

(1) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 438(c)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(2) EXTENSION OF FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 438(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(d)) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(e) REPEAL OF EXPIRED PROVISIONS.—Section 438(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(e)) is repealed.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE JOHN H. CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM AND RELATED PROVISIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO SERVE FORMER FOSTER YOUTH UP TO AGE 23.—Section 477 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 677) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by inserting ''(or 23 years of age, in the case of a State with a certification under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii) to provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained such age, in accordance with such subsection)'' after ''21 years of age'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A)—

(A) by inserting ''(i)'' before ''A certification'';

(B) by striking ''children who have left foster care'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 21 years of age.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) If the State has elected under section 475(8)(B) to extend eligibility for foster care to all children who have not attained 21 years of age, or if the Secretary determines that the State agency responsible for administering the State plans under this part and part B uses State funds or any other funds not provided under this part to provide services and assistance for youths who have aged out of foster care that are comparable to the services and assistance the youths would receive if the State had made such an election, the certification required under clause (i) may provide that the State will provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 23 years of age.''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(3)(B), by striking ''children who have left foster care'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 21 years of age (or 23 years of age, in the case of a State with a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) to provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained such age, in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii)).''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO REDISTRIBUTE UNSPENT FUNDS.—Section 477(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''or does not expend allocated funds within the time period specified under section 477(d)(3)'' after ''provided by the Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.—

''(A) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—To the extent that amounts paid to States under this section in a fiscal year remain unexpended by the States at the end of the succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary may make the amounts available for redistribution in the 2nd succeeding fiscal year among the States that apply for additional funds under this section for that 2nd succeeding fiscal year.

''(B) REDISTRIBUTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall redistribute the amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year among eligible applicant States. In this subparagraph, the term 'eligible applicant State' means a State that has applied for additional funds for the fiscal year under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the State will use the funds for the purpose for which originally allotted under this section.

''(ii) AMOUNT TO BE REDISTRIBUTED.—The amount to be redistributed to each eligible applicant State shall be the amount so made available multiplied by the State foster care ratio, (as defined in subsection (c)(4), except that, in such subsection, 'all eligible applicant States (as defined in subsection (d)(5)(B)(i))' shall be substituted for 'all States').

''(iii) TREATMENT OF REDISTRIBUTED AMOUNT.—Any amount made available to a State under this paragraph shall be regarded as part of the allotment of the State under this section for the fiscal year in which the redistribution is made.

''(C) TRIBES.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' includes an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that receives an allotment under this section.''.

(c) EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING THE USE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING VOUCHERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 477(i)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(i)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''on the date'' and all that follows through ''23'' and inserting ''to remain eligible until they attain 26''; and

(B) by inserting '', but in no event may a youth participate in the program for more than 5 years (whether or not consecutive)'' before the period.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 477(i)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(i)(1)) is amended by inserting ''who have attained 14 years of age'' before the period.

(d) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 477 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677), as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c), is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM**'' and inserting ''**PROGRAM FOR SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION TO ADULTHOOD**'';*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''identify children who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age and to help these children make the transition to self-sufficiency by providing services'' and inserting ''support all youth who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older in their transition to adulthood through transitional services'';

(ii) by inserting ''and post-secondary education'' after ''high school diploma''; and

(iii) by striking ''training in daily living skills, training in budgeting and financial management skills'' and inserting ''training and opportunities to practice daily living skills (such as financial literacy training and driving instruction)'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age receive the education, training, and services necessary to obtain employment'' and inserting ''who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older achieve meaningful, permanent connections with a caring adult'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age prepare for and enter postsecondary training and education institutions'' and inserting ''who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities, positive youth development, and experiential learning that reflects what their peers in intact families experience''; and

(D) by striking paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (7);

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking ''adolescents'' and inserting ''youth''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting ''including training on youth development'' after ''to provide training''; and

(II) by striking ''adolescents preparing for independent living'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''youth preparing for a successful transition to adulthood and making a permanent connection with a caring adult.'';

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''adolescents'' each place it appears and inserting ''youth''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (K)—

(I) by striking ''an adolescent'' and inserting ''a youth''; and

(II) by striking ''the adolescent'' each place it appears and inserting ''the youth''; and

(4) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than October 1, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the National Youth in Transition Database and any other databases in which States report outcome measures relating to children in foster care and children who have aged out of foster care or left foster care for kinship guardianship or adoption. The report shall include the following:

''(A) A description of the reasons for entry into foster care and of the foster care experiences, such as length of stay, number of placement settings, case goal, and discharge reason of 17-year-olds who are surveyed by the National Youth in Transition Database and an analysis of the comparison of that description with the reasons for entry and foster care experiences of children of other ages who exit from foster care before attaining age 17.

''(B) A description of the characteristics of the individuals who report poor outcomes at ages 19 and 21 to the National Youth in Transition Database.

''(C) Benchmarks for determining what constitutes a poor outcome for youth who remain in or have exited from foster care and plans the Executive branch will take to incorporate these benchmarks in efforts to evaluate child welfare agency performance in providing services to children transitioning from foster care.

''(D) An analysis of the association between types of placement, number of overall placements, time spent in foster care, and other factors, and outcomes at ages 19 and 21.

''(E) An analysis of the differences in outcomes for children in and formerly in foster care at age 19 and 21 among States.''.

(e) CLARIFYING DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO FOSTER YOUTH LEAVING FOSTER CARE.—Section 475(5)(I) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(I)) is

amended by inserting after ''REAL ID Act of 2005'' the following: '', and any official documentation necessary to prove that the child was previously in foster care''.

TITLE IV—CONTINUING INCENTIVES TO STATES TO PROMOTE ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP

SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZING ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.

Section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''2013 through 2015'' and inserting ''2016 through 2020'';

(2) in subsection (h)(1)(D), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2021''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2021''.

TITLE V—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 501. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 440 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629m) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 440. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(1) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable Federal law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(2) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable Federal law.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(1) incorporate a widely accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(2) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(3) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(5) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(6) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than the date that is 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule that—

(1) identifies federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges; and

(2) specifies State implementation options and describes future milestones.

SEC. 502. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO STATE REQUIREMENT TO ADDRESS THE DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS OF YOUNG CHILDREN.

Section 422(b)(18) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(18)) is amended by striking ''such children'' and inserting ''all vulnerable children under 5 years of age''.

TITLE VI—ENSURING STATES REINVEST SAVINGS RESULTING FROM INCREASE IN ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 601. DELAY OF ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PHASE-IN.

Section 473(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''fiscal year'' each place it appears and inserting ''period''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''fiscal year'' and inserting ''period''; and

(B) in the table—

(i) by striking ''of fiscal year:'' and inserting ''of:'';

(ii) by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2010'';

(iii) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2011'';

(iv) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2012'';

(v) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2013'';

(vi) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2014'';

(vii) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2015'';

(viii) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2019'';

(ix) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''April 1, 2019, through March 31, 2020''; and

(x) by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''April 1, 2020,''.

SEC. 602. GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON STATE REINVESTMENT OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM INCREASE IN ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall study the extent to which States are complying with the requirements of section 473(a)(8) of the Social Security Act relating to the effects of phasing out the AFDC income eligibility requirements for adoption assistance payments under section 473 of the Social Security Act, as enacted by section 402 of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–351; 122 Stat. 3975) and amended by section 206 of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113–183; 128 Stat. 1919). In particular, the Comptroller General shall analyze the extent to which States are complying with the following requirements under section 473(a)(8)(D) of the Social Security Act:

(1) The requirement to spend an amount equal to the amount of the savings (if any) in State expenditures under part E of title IV of the Social Security resulting from phasing out the AFDC income eligibility requirements for adoption assistance payments under section 473 of such Act to provide to children of families any service that may be provided under part B or E of title IV of such Act.

(2) The requirement that a State shall spend not less than 30 percent of the amount of any savings described in subparagraph (A) on post-adoption services, post-guardianship services, and services to support and sustain positive permanent outcomes for children who otherwise might enter into foster care under the responsibility of the State, with at least ⅔ of the spending by the State to comply with the 30 percent requirement being spent on post-adoption and post-guardianship services.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a), including recommendations to ensure compliance with laws referred to in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 5456, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Nation is in the grips of an opioid and heroin epidemic, which, according to States, is responsible for recent spikes in the need for out-of-home foster care placement after more than a decade of decline.

Under current child welfare financing, when a family is struggling, the majority of Federal dollars are only available if the State removes a child from his or her biological and adoptive home and places that child in foster care.

Even though it is often less expensive and more effective to keep a child safely at home, Federal support for these types of prevention services are extremely limited. Children who are raised by the State in foster care face increased risks of substance abuse, homelessness, teen pregnancy, and other negative outcomes.

The Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 will reverse the current trends by supporting early, evidence-based, cost-effective interventions to keep children safely at home. This will increase the likelihood of positive short-term and long-term outcomes for both children and their parents. Moreover, it will ensure that children who do not need foster care are appropriately placed with families whenever possible.

Preliminary estimates are that the cost of the up-front prevention services to strengthen families will be more than fully offset by both reducing inappropriate placements into group homes for foster children, as well as briefly delaying additional adoption assistance to allow for a comprehensive GAO review to be completed.

In May, the Human Resources Subcommittee heard about challenges and successes of those on the ground as they attempt to fight the opioid and heroin epidemic in their communities. Today, we will move forward to ensure more struggling families get the help they so vitally need.

This bill is a result of a bipartisan, bicameral effort. So I would like to thank Ranking Member LEVIN and our Senate Finance Committee colleagues, Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN, for working so diligently on this effort.

This bill also incorporates bipartisan efforts by Congressman YOUNG and

Congressman DAVIS to improve the exchange of information across State lines to get foster children settled into homes more quickly.

I would like to thank my fellow committee members, the bipartisan group of original cosponsors, and those on the committee who have also joined to sponsor this important legislation.

Finally, I would like to recognize the overwhelming support we have received from the child welfare community who, I know, have been working on this issue for many, many years, some say as long as 30 years, in terms of the prevention care for our kids.

I include in the RECORD some of these more than 60 letters of support we have received so far on this bill.

CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
Chicago, IL, June 14, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Congress, Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDY LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN: As a nationwide membership organization comprised of many of the most long standing and respected child and family organizations in the country, Children's Home Society of America is writing in support of your efforts to promote and improve outcomes for many of the hundreds of thousands of children and youth who come to the attention of the child welfare system each year, including children in foster care. Over the decades the House Ways and Means Committee, with bipartisan support, has taken significant steps forward on behalf of our most vulnerable children and the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 continues those efforts.

Allowing funds under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, currently used primarily for out-of-home care for children, to be used for the first time for prevention services to help keep children at risk of placement in foster care safely at home with their parents or with kin is a significant move in the right direction. Kinship caregivers play a critical role in protecting children temporarily while their parents are not able to and also in ensuring new permanent families for children who cannot return home.

We strongly support the bill's recognition of the importance of quality services for these children, which are evidence-based and trauma-informed and the importance of accountability in tracking the provision of services and their benefits for children. States at different stages in reforming their systems will also have help training staff for the development and delivery of these new services and putting in place the infrastructure needed to administer and oversee their delivery and child outcomes.

The Family First Prevention Services Act over time also will take important steps to ensure children who need to enter foster care will be placed in the least restrictive setting appropriate to their needs, by targeting federal dollars only on smaller family-foster homes and on other care settings for children and youth with special treatment needs or those in special circumstances, such as pregnant and parenting teens or older youth in independent living settings. A number of states already have undertaken special efforts to reduce the number of children in congregate care and to preserve group care settings for children with special treatment needs.

Children and society pay a high cost when the current systems fail to adequately address the needs of the children who come to the attention of our child welfare systems, nearly 80 percent of whom are victims of neglect. We believe that the specific changes proposed will go far in encouraging state and local child welfare systems, private providers, the courts and youth and families who have been involved in the system to work together to achieve significant change for children over the next decade.

We look forward to working with you to ensure these new child welfare finance reforms will truly benefit children who come to the attention of the child welfare system and to continue to explore additional improvements on their behalf to ensure they all have safe, permanent families. Thank you for your continuing leadership on behalf of these children.

Sincerely,

SHARON OSBORNE,
Board Chair.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, WI.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Human Resources Subcommittee, House Committee on Ways & Means, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN: Children's Hospital of Wisconsin strongly supports the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 (H.R. 5456). We applaud your leadership on this important issue.

Children's Hospital of Wisconsin (Children's) is the region's only independent health care system dedicated solely to the health and well-being of children. We serve children from every county in the state and are recognized as one of the leading pediatric health care centers in the United States. In addition, Children's is the largest not-for-profit, community-based child and family serving agency in Wisconsin. Through our Community Services work, we provide a continuum of care to more than 15,000 children and families annually. This includes family preservation and support, child and family counseling, child welfare, child advocacy and protection, and foster care and adoption services.

We strongly support the Family First Prevention Services Act that would allow funds under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act to be used for the first time for evidence-based prevention services to help keep children at risk of placement in foster care safely at home with their parents or with kin. The legislation represents a significant and meaningful shift in child welfare policy by prioritizing up-front, evidence-based services to keep families together. We know from experience and empirical research that this is important for the healthy development of children.

The bill also makes significant advancements to integrate interventions and measures focused on child well-being into the child welfare system. Children's believes that prioritizing and providing accountability for child well-being, in addition to safety and permanency, is critical to achieving better outcomes for children and society and positioning children to thrive into adulthood.

Children's is committed to improving the health and well-being of children and families. We believe the Family First Prevention Services Act will enable the child welfare system to better serve our most vulnerable children and families.

Sincerely,

AMY HERBST,
Vice President, Child Well-Being.

[From the American Academy of Pediatrics, June 13, 2016]

AAP STATEMENT SUPPORTING THE FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT

(By Benard P. Dreyer, MD, FAAP)

''The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) commends House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Kevin Brady (R–Tex) and Ranking Member Sander Levin (D–Mich) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R–Utah) and Ranking Member Ron Wyden (D–Ore) for releasing the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016, a comprehensive, bipartisan effort to improve how the child welfare system serves children and families in adversity. This bill represents a pivotal opportunity for a major federal policy shift that moves away from placing children in out-of-home care and toward keeping families together.

''Children in or at-risk for entering foster care are especially vulnerable, they are more likely to be exposed to trauma and often have complex medical needs. This bill not only recognizes the unique needs of children and families in adversity, but also makes great strides to meet them in a way that pediatricians can stand behind through evidence-based, prevention-focused approaches. The bill offers states much-needed federal funding to support mental health, substance abuse and in-home parenting skills programs for families of children at-risk of entering foster care. This policy rewards state efforts to preserve and strengthen families by providing federal funds to administer prevention programs in a way that is steeped in science.

''Children fare best when they are raised in families equipped to meet their needs. Congregate care, when necessary, should be of high-quality for the shortest possible duration and reserved for instances in which it is absolutely essential. The AAP supports the bill's emphasis on ensuring that children are only placed in a non-family setting if they have a demonstrated need for the services available in that setting. The AAP also appreciates that congregate care facilities must be accredited and have licensed clinical and nursing staff to ensure they are capable of caring for vulnerable children and meeting their complex health needs.

''Fixing the shortcomings in our child welfare system will require continued investment across both state and federal governments. The Family First Prevention Services Act does just what its name says—it puts families first. This bill represents major, meaningful progress toward protecting children and supporting their families in creating safe and stable homes. Pediatricians look forward to continuing to work alongside bipartisan members of Congress to advance the bill toward a vote as soon as possible.''

CHILDREN AND FAMILY FUTURES,
Lake Forest, CA, June 13, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House Representatives.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.
Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Human Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.
Hon. SANDY LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.
Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Human Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR WAYS AND MEANS AND SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN BRADY AND HATCH, RANKING MEMBERS LEVIN AND WYDEN AND HUMAN RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of Children and Family Futures, I am pleased to share our support for the Family First Prevention Services Act (H.R. 5456) introduced today by House Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee Chairman Vern Buchanan (R–FL) and joined by eleven other bi-partisan original co-sponsors.

Children and Family Futures, a national nonprofit organization based in Lake Forest, California, has more than 20 years of experience in improving outcomes for children at the intersection of child welfare and substance use disorder treatment agencies and family courts. We recently had the opportunity to testify at Senate Finance and Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Hearings on the effects of opioids on our nation's child welfare agencies. As you may know, there are 8.3 million children—almost 11% of America's children—who live with a parent who is alcoholic or needs treatment for illicit drug abuse. About two-thirds of the children who enter the child welfare system are affected by parents with substance use disorders, and when we ask children and youth in foster care what they need the most, they often ask for substance abuse treatment for their parents so that their family can stay together. Quality substance abuse prevention and treatment is one of the cornerstones of a strong and effective child welfare system.

H.R. 5456 takes several critical steps to ensure that parents and children receive the full range of supportive services they need to heal and thrive. By allowing federal IV–E dollars to be used in a time-limited way for evidence-based prevention services, including mental health, substance abuse prevention and in-home skill-based programs, the proposed legislation provides an unprecedented opportunity for child welfare agencies to expand the services parents need to continue to care for their children safely without unnecessary foster care placements.

In addition, allowing states to draw down Title IV–E foster care maintenance payments on behalf of children who are placed in residential family treatment settings with a parent who is receiving treatment is another effective way to ensure that families can stay together while getting the services and supports they need to get back on their feet. For children whose parents struggle with alcohol and illicit drug abuse, the elimination of the time limit to allow family reunification services to be provided to any child in foster care and for up to 15 months after a child is reunited with his or her biological family will allow children of parents who are still in the very first stages of recovery to get the ongoing help they need to maintain both stability and sobriety.

CFF also strongly supports H.R. 5456's reauthorization of the Regional Partnership Grant program that provides funding to state and regional grantees seeking to provide evidence-based services to prevent child abuse and neglect related to substance abuse and revised grant requirements based on lessons learned from the most effective past grants. In addition to updating the program to specifically address the opioid and heroin epidemic, the proposal legislation leverages what has been learned to ensure that new foster care prevention funding provided under the bill is used effectively.

In addition to providing much-needed attention to prevention services for children and families who come to the attention of the child welfare system, the legislation's provisions to reduce the over-reliance on group care facilities are an equally important step in supporting children and keeping families together. The legislation's current approach to reducing unnecessary care while enhancing the protections and oversight for Qualified Residential Treatment Programs (QRTP) will ensure that young people who are struggling with their own substance use disorder or mental health issues have full access to clinically appropriate residential treatment options and that a continuum of quality services are available to help them transition back home to their families. Moreover, improving and expediting an effective assessment process and increasing judicial oversight of placement decisions on an ongoing basis also represent significant progress in connecting young people with the right services on a timely basis while also maintaining positive family and community connections.

Untreated substance use disorders are among the most critical and devastating crises facing the nation's children and families. Thanks to the leadership and bipartisanship demonstrated by members of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, H.R. 5456 offers a range of innovative solutions designed to keep children and families together and provide the services and supports they need to lead healthy and productive lives. We are deeply appreciative of your collective work on this bill and are confident that, if passed, it will continue to help thousands children and families, now and for years to come.

Sincerely,

NANCY K. YOUNG, Ph.D.,
Director.
SIDNEY L. GARDNER, M.P.A.,
President.

ALLIANCE FOR STRONG FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY, *Chair,*
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. VERN BUCHANAN, *Chair,*
Human Resources Subcommittee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Chair,*
Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN, *Ranking Member,*
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
Human Resources Subcommittee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. RON WYDEN, *Ranking Member,*
Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN, CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT, AND CHAIRMAN HATCH AND RANKING MEMBER WYDEN: The Alliance for Strong Families and Communities thanks you for your leadership and for introducing the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016. The legislation promotes numerous policy priorities that are consistent with our network's guiding principles for improving child and family safety, permanency and well-being.

We appreciate efforts you have made to address past concerns and to include components that are informed by effective practices in states and localities, technology updates, and current research. These include:

Permitting the use of federal funds to pay for programs across the evidence-based spectrum, and to continue knowledge formation in what works;

Making Title IV-B funds available to states so that they may modernize their Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) services so that so that children may be more quickly and effectively placed in appropriate homes across state lines;

Supporting the National Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities' recommendation that a 21st Century Child Welfare system require states to develop a statewide plan to prevent child abuse and neglect fatalities;

Requiring the use of an age-appropriate, evidence-based, validated needs assessment to help determine a child's need for behavioral health support through a therapeutic residential treatment setting; and

Engaging families in a child's residentially-based trauma-informed behavioral health treatment to strengthen the likelihood of their success, including establishing a family and permanency team in the initial needs assessment and ongoing progress monitoring.

We are very pleased with the bipartisan, bicameral effort to address child welfare reforms, and specifically, the longstanding policy priority to expand Title IV-E for prevention so that children and parents/caregivers may have access to services and interventions that ensure child safety and build family stability.

While the Alliance enthusiastically supports the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016, we do believe we have identified a significant technical misalignment within the definition of the Qualified Residential Treatment Program (QRTP) that, if addressed, would strengthen the bill, increase its effectiveness and mitigate against what we believe to be unintended consequences for children to whom we want to receive the right treatment, at the right time in the most appropriate setting. We fully support the requirement for a QRTP to use a trauma-informed treatment model, but are concerned about the rigid aspects of the language for QRTP staffing. The prescription of nursing and clinical staff being onsite during business hours is not consistent with Congress' desire to use evidence in its requirements on states and moves further away from a system that is child- and family-centered and community-based. We believe that QRTPs must abide by the fidelity elements of the approved, trauma-informed treatment model that they elect to use in accordance with the requirements in the bill and that the current language regarding staffing is inconsistent with the bill's treatment model requirement.

For example, if the fidelity elements of the selected treatment model require licensed or registered nurses to be onsite during business hours and available 24/7, then a QRTP must meet that requirement. Likewise, if fidelity to an approved model requires a different staffing composition and pattern, then the QRTP must meet that model's requirements and needs the flexibility to do so.

Therefore, rather than requiring the staff to be onsite during business hours, we recommend an amendment that aligns the treatment model requirement with the staffing requirement. The amendment would require staff to be onsite according to the trauma-informed treatment model being used by the QRTP. Our commonsense amendment acknowledges that high quality trauma-informed treatment models prescribe staffing patterns that are designed to achieve the outcomes proven by the program model. And, it strengthens the bill's effectiveness toward the greatest chance of success and normalcy for children provided in the most family-like settings possible.

The Alliance's wholehearted support of the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 is unqualified and not contingent upon inclusion of the recommended amendment but, if the bill is passed without this amendment we intend to work to build a coalition to change this aspect of the QRTP requirements prior to implementation of these provisions in Title II in 2019.

Thank you very much for your hard work. We look forward to working with you and encourage you to contact Marlo Nash, Senior Vice President of Public Policy and Mobilization at *mnash@alliancel.org* with questions or to request additional information.

Sincerely,

SUSAN DREYFUS,
President and CEO.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill before us today, the Family First Prevention Services Act, has a very simple goal: improve the lives of our most vulnerable children. We worked across the aisle on this legislation because we recognize the importance of ensuring that kids grow up in safe, loving, and stable homes.

I mentioned that we worked together on this. Mr. BUCHANAN, who is the chairman of our committee, others on the Republican side, and Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, and others worked so hard on this, and I think it has improved this legislation.

Our foster care system provides an essential safe haven for abused and neglected children. However, when it comes to our system today, it is clear that Federal funding has been stacked against prevention efforts. That means our Federal dollars aren't being used to effectively help families and prevent child abuse and neglect in homes. In fact, less than 10 percent of dedicated child welfare funding goes toward prevention.

This bill is intended to make sure families receive the help they needed before a child goes into foster care, not after, as our current system largely functions. This bill would provide substance abuse treatment for parents, support efforts to improve parenting skills and expand access to mental health care.

The Children's Defense Fund, which tirelessly advocates for our most vulnerable children, offered its full support for this bill, and it is my privilege to quote the Children's Defense Fund under its so esteemed leader: ''It takes historic and long overdue steps to direct Federal child welfare dollars to improve outcomes for vulnerable children and families.''

Simply put, this bill would help keep kids throughout our country safe and in their homes instead of placing them in a foster care system that we should use only when clearly necessary. It would be preferable if the bill's key provisions on prevention started sooner to help States facing immediate crises.

Furthermore, this legislation certainly does not address every problem facing our child welfare system, including the need to recruit more foster family homes; but, indeed, this bill is an important step forward in strengthening our Nation's child welfare system in the long-term. In fact, as we have seen, more than 50 organizations dedicated to advocating for vulnerable children have come out in support of this legislation, including, as mentioned, the Children's Defense Fund, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Prevent Child Abuse America, the American Psychological Association, Voice for Adoption, and the North American Council on Adoptable Children. This bill has also been endorsed by the national association representing State child welfare agency directors.

This legislation represents an effort to find important common ground in the House and also in the Senate with the leadership of Senators HATCH and WYDEN. We have more work to do. We have more work to do, indeed, to ensure our children have the opportunities and support they need to thrive, but this bill would take a very important step on that path.

So, once again, I would like to thank my colleagues on the Republican side and on the Democratic side. I would like to thank the staff on our side and, I am sure, the same has been true of the Republican side for all of their diligent and impassioned work on this important issue.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be governed and managed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Each day in America, as many as eight children die at the hands of those who are supposed to be caring for them. Three out of four of these children are under the age of three. Half of them will never reach their first birthday, and countless others of all ages will forever be scarred by abuse and by neglect.

The legislation that we consider tonight is all that remains of a comprehensive child safety bill offered by Senator RON WYDEN and offered by me here in the House last year. I salute his leadership then, and I accept his decision to settle for a small bit of what we sought to accomplish rather than no bit at all.

This year, Senator WYDEN put a fraction of our original bill into a proposal to which Senator ORRIN HATCH agreed, a bipartisan Family First draft proposal. Today's bill is a fraction of a fraction of our original initiative.

□ 1930

Despite the valiant efforts of many local groups and individuals across Texas, we have a child abuse crisis there. As The Dallas Morning News reported last month: ''Staggering number of Texas children in imminent danger neglected by CPS''—Child Protective Services—''investigation shows.''

And the same is true in one State after another. In short, the Republican answer in this bill is to do absolutely nothing with regard to child prevention services in additional resources now, to essentially do nothing about this crisis now, to continue neglecting the neglected this year, next year, and the year after that.

Adoption has proven one way that we can keep children out of the foster care system and in a loving family. I know this is not Mr. BUCHANAN's personal view, but the only way that House Republicans would agree for us to fund additional preventive services for these children to avoid child abuse—even though that takes 3 long, painful years of delay—is by our cutting about $700 million from adoption.

The other source of funding is congregate or group care. I believe we do need a change in group care, but while agreeing, I note that in Texas last month there were over 60 foster care youth. The only place they could find to sleep was in the State offices of Child Protective Services, and one has to ask about this bill the question of where these children will go if those group facilities are no longer available.

This measure was approved on the same day that the Committee on Ways and Means approved barring over $50 billion for additional tax breaks, and yet not another dime of additional resources to prevent child abuse this year. They demanded that there could be no resources going into child abuse unless it was paid for from other human resources, essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul.

One important aspect of the bill is the kinship provision, that assisting relatives who are willing to raise a child, keep them in a family home so they won't be bounced around from one place to another, that they get some support. I think it is a worthy approach, but it also shows how this House Republican proposal has slashed relief.

This year's bipartisan recommendation by Senators WYDEN and HATCH was estimated to cost $1.7 billion for kinship. Today we have a mere 8 percent—8 percent—of what they recommended, hardly worthy of a celebration. The major focus of this bill is to provide a

Federal incentive for the States to invest in prevention and early intervention to ensure the safety of children. For too long we backloaded everything. We responded to abuse after it occurred instead of trying to prevent it at the beginning.

We offer assistance now through this bill eventually, and we should be focused on it. I agree fully with that focus. That is why I plan to vote, reluctantly, for this proposal. But this bill would give the States an incentive through what is called Title IV–E, where the Federal Government would put up 50 percent, 50 cents on the dollar that is expended, and the States would put up 50 cents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Unfortunately, this bill provides no immediate relief for children who are in danger right now. No additional funds for 3 years. In Texas, with the opioid crisis, and in other States, these children need help now. It has gotten so bad that Federal courts are beginning to declare these systems unconstitutional. We could have done better by these children. We have the capacity to do better. We have not had the will to do better in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, having no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), one of the members of our committee who has been a real advocate for children suffering from abuse.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Child welfare advocates have used the adjectives ''landmark,'' ''historic,'' and ''trailblazing'' to describe this bill. I wholeheartedly agree with them. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation that begins a fundamental shift in Federal child welfare policy to preserving families rather than separating them.

I am deeply grateful to Ranking Member LEVIN, Chairman BRADY, Chairman BUCHANAN, Ranking Member WYDEN, and Chairman HATCH for including many provisions for which I have advocated, provisions that will substantially strengthen families in Chicago, in Illinois, and throughout the Nation. I am equally grateful to Ranking Member DOGGETT for his tireless efforts to secure additional resources for prevention.

My congressional district has the highest percentage of children living with grandparent caregivers in the Nation, followed closely by two other congressional districts in Illinois. We know that substance abuse and addiction underlie a substantial percentage of child welfare cases and separates families.

When I ask foster youth what policymakers could do to make child welfare better, they almost always say: You could have helped my mom and dad.

That is exactly what we are doing here today. The Family First Prevention Services Act invests in addressing key reasons that families struggle by providing evidence-based mental health, substance abuse, and parenting services to strengthen families so they can avoid the child welfare system. I am especially pleased that the bill includes my work to improve the effectiveness of child abuse and neglect prevention related to substance abuse by modernizing the Regional Partnership Grants.

Coupled with the prevention services, the extension of the Kinship Navigator program, the improved licensing standards to address barriers for relative caregivers, the extension of adoption and legal guardianship incentive payments, the new services for pregnant and parenting foster youth, the investment in electronic systems to improve interstate placement of youth, and the funding to support children in staying with their parents in residential treatment all promise to improve permanency and well-being for youth and kinship caregivers.

I want to thank the chairperson of my Child Welfare Task Force, Dr. Annetta Wilson, for sharing her expertise on how to improve policies to support children and families. I also want to thank Pam Rodriguez and George Williams with TASC in Chicago as well as Nancy Young with Children and Family Futures for sharing their expertise about what policies work to support parents affected by substance abuse so that we can strengthen families.

Finally, this is not a perfect bill, but it is a historic bill and a unique opportunity to strengthen families. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to enact additional supports for kinship caregivers, enhance services for expectant and parenting foster youth, and to protect the Social Security benefits of foster youth.

I attended a high school graduation last Friday, and the young lady who got the biggest applause was one whose mother and grandmothers both had died within the last 3 years. She also has given birth to two children. But she graduated with honors, and it is the assistance and help that we give to these young people who really prove that we can have an effective welfare help system for young people who need the help.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), who, though not a formal member of our committee, has been a very active participant in our subcommittee and who chairs the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, among others.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5456. I believe this is a very positive step forward to reforming the child welfare system in our country.

H.R. 5456 takes into account what has been learned from years of county and State efforts at reform in the form of waivers. We have learned a lot. We have learned that we can safely reduce the numbers of children in care by providing services up front, prevention services that, until now, could not be supported with Federal dollars unless the State or county had a waiver.

What do we know?

We know that the main reason why children are in foster care is because of child neglect, and the main reason for this is substance abuse and mental illness. For example, there are programs, such as SHIELDS for Families in Los Angeles, that have been able to reduce the number of children in care by providing substance abuse services for families for 12 months.

The problem with H.R. 5456, however, is that services would be cut off after 12 months, and one of the features of addiction is relapse.

So what happens to a family if the individual relapses on the 11th month? Will the children automatically be removed and placed into care?

I think during the implementation phase, we need to consider flexibility with cutting off services at the end of 12 months.

The same thing applies to mental health services. The Chafee Grant is another thing that is a positive feature of H.R. 5456. Chafee grants help young people transition to adulthood. I am pleased that H.R. 5456 includes my language to extend time to 23 years old for a young person to receive prevention services. What these services are are essentially services that help a young person transition to adulthood, such as housing, counseling, job training, et cetera. Chafee is also extended in H.R. 5456 to the age of 26 for educational grants.

I want to applaud my State of California, where reforms are underway. We have passed legislation in California that long recognizes the need for housing to transition young people out of care, but in California we have had the insight and foresight to understand that children 16 years old sometimes want to transition out of the foster care system. Unfortunately, H.R. 5456 eliminates funding for children who are 16 years old.

I am concerned that the bill might have some unintended consequences. I think we would all agree that it would be best to keep a child in a family setting when they are 16 years old. However, many young people wind up running away from foster homes. Unfortunately, they wind up suffering from abuse, again, in a foster home, and

they need to be transitioned into adulthood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. BASS. I am hoping H.R. 5456 will take into consideration unintended consequences and not contribute to homelessness amongst youth.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago I authored and passed into law the Protect our Kids Act. It became law with the help of former Ways and Means Republican Chair Dave Camp, and it established a commission to eliminate child abuse and neglect fatalities. It is a mark of the progress—or the lack of progress that this year, when that commission came forward with its report, Republicans on our committee would not permit a hearing to accept the modest findings of the commission.

And so we have reached tonight. I was offered in the traditional Washington way an opportunity to put my name on this legislation. It has some meritorious provisions that eventually come into effect, but I could not do that and face my constituents in Texas saying that I had done something to address this crisis when I know, in fact, we are not doing what needs to be done to address this crisis.

□ 1945

I advanced one of many alternatives to provide the dollars to deal with this crisis now. That was a proposal not for new taxes, but it was a proposal for tax compliance that would have fully funded the bipartisan agreement from the Senate.

But for the ideological commitment to oppose any new resources going to address child abuse, we would have those dollars. We wouldn't be taking the money out of good adoption programs. We wouldn't be delaying a response for 3 years. We would be doing something now to address the challenges that are out there for the children who face abuse and neglect today.

That is what should be happening. That is what today's bill fails to do, though it offers us the promise of eventual action to do what we should be doing right now.

And why wait three years to respond to this crisis? Because the Republican-controlled Ways and Means Committee that vulnerable children can receive federal relief only from money taken from other children or other portions of initiatives within the jurisdiction of the Human Resources Subcommittee. Republicans rejected the use of any additional resources to prevent child abuse, including a simple tax compliance measure that would require the filing of a 1099 for alimony payments to ensure that those payments were being reported as income, which federal law has long required. That modest requirement would have provided more than $2 billion of resources, without raising a dime of taxes.

Because taking money from adoption and congregate care fails to fully fund even today's delayed response, Republicans must also today waive a Budget point of order, since this bill does not comply with their own Budget rules.

Finally, this bill makes wholly unjustified and discriminatory cuts to adoption assistance. The sole reason for these cuts is budgetary—that was apparently the easiest way to find funds instead of adding the necessary revenue. This bill is paid for, in part, by delaying funding for children under the age of 4 to be adopted out of foster care, for those children with special needs, physical or mental, who are the hardest to adopt. According to a law Congress passed in 2008, those adopting 2- and 3-years-olds, who would otherwise have been entering foster care, would have been eligible in October for modest federal assistance; infants and 1-year-olds would have been eligible next year. Now, that funding will be delayed 2½ years, to pay for new services, none of which become available until 2020. The only excuse given for taking almost $700 million that otherwise would have supported adoptions is that some states are failing to reinvest in foster children the money that they save in foster care costs for each child who is adopted. There is no example of fraud or abuse, only the all too typical diversion by some states for other public services. Some states like Texas, which so regularly ignores the needs of its children, reinvested only a dime of every dollar of adoption savings in foster care. Others like Florida followed federal law and reinvested every dollar of their savings. This bill discriminates against Florida and similar states.

And what does this bill propose to do to crack down on this state diversion of savings from adoption? It asks for a government report. In 2014, Congress enacted provisions of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act to prevent diversion. The Administration should enforce that Act. Requesting that the Government Accountability Office provide information already available from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services adds nothing not already known. But if all we wanted was a report, we could get that report just by writing a letter to the GAO. Seeking another report represents cover for taking away resources that would otherwise have benefitted blameless infants and toddlers.

We have a serious problem that deserves a serious state-federal, bipartisan solution. I am not opposing today's bill, but it does far less than it could and should have. It is a true missed opportunity to help some of our most vulnerable Americans. Today's bill does something, someday. We ought to be responding fully and effectively this day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, this is bipartisan, bicameral legislation. It takes important steps to keep more children safely at home and out of foster care.

Under the current law, most Federal funding for child welfare is directed toward reimbursing States after they place a child in foster care. This is the least desirable outcome.

This legislation turns this around by putting resources towards preventative services to keep children safely with their parents or relatives. Most importantly, this bill will help ensure that more children grow up in a safe home surrounded by a stable family.

Strong families make for a strong community. I urge my colleagues to support the Family First Prevention Services Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5456, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1777. An act to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2736. An act to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

WORLD HARVEST CHURCH'S 15th ANNUAL HONOR OUR HEROES

(Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's Sixth Congressional District, I rise today to recognize the amazing works of Roswell, Georgia's World Harvest Church and their 15th annual Honor Our Heroes event scheduled for July 3 of this year.

The World Harvest Church has made a truly meaningful difference in people's lives by going into communities and ministering to all, young and old, with messages of hope and demonstrating the true love of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, part of this service is their annual Honor Our Heroes event, which is a wonderful opportunity for our local community to honor our veterans whose selfless acts of heroism have helped maintain our most fundamental freedoms: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The World Harvest Church also serves as headquarters for missionary

teams that travel internationally and administer help to those in dire need by building churches and centers of refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I offer our deepest appreciation for the World Harvest Church's pastor, Mirek Hufton, a faithful follower of God and a man of the highest compassion. Our Nation is made better by, and we are truly blessed by, World Harvest Church.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4768, which the House will consider later this week. This bill will prevent Federal agencies from using creative interpretations of law to expand their own authority.

In an ideal world, agencies would implement the law as Congress writes it. You wouldn't have judicial deference to agency interpretations of the law.

Unfortunately, we do not live in that ideal world. And rather than respect congressional intent, Federal agencies, especially under the Obama administration, have time and time again interpreted the laws in ways never intended in order to increase their own power.

The waters of the United States proposal and the Clean Power Plan, both rejected with bipartisan opposition, are just two recent examples of agency overreach.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress remind these agencies that the people's elected Representatives, not bureaucracies, write our Nation's laws, not unaccountable bureaucrats or courts willing to go along with it.

CELEBRATING THE PENNSYLVANIA MARINE CORPS LEAGUE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Pennsylvania Marine Corps League. The organization will hold its 71st annual department convention later this week in State College, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, the Marine Corps League was founded by Major General John A. Lejeune in 1923 and chartered by an act of Congress on August 4, 1937. Today, the Marine Corps League has a membership of more than 50,000 men and women and is comprised of honorably discharged, Active Duty, and Reserve Marines, including both officers and enlisted men and women.

I have the deepest respect for the accomplishments of the U.S. Marine Corps over the course of our Nation's history. The Corps was founded on November 10, 1775, and since then, those who have served as marines have shared the unyielding commitment to protecting the lives of American citizens and the interests of our Nation.

Marines have served our Nation bravely since before the start of the American Revolution, proving their courage from the shores of Tripoli to the island of Iwo Jima and, in recent actions, in places such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the men and women from Pennsylvania and across our Nation who have served as United States Marines.

TIME TO ACT ON GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that is very alarming to many people across the country, an issue that saddens everyone, and an issue that, sadly, isn't being addressed by this Congress.

Last week, we lost 49 innocent lives in the worst mass shooting that our country has ever seen. Sadly, it is not an insulated case. Let me give you some numbers:

In the 3 years since the terrible tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, there have been over 1,100 mass shootings. More than 34,000 lives have been cut short by someone using a gun. The House of Representatives has held 30 moments of silence for the victims of mass shootings since Sandy Hook, and yet we haven't taken a single vote on legislation that would help keep guns out of dangerous hands.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is shameful. The American people deserve more than silence. The American people deserve a Congress that is willing to stand up and do whatever it takes to keep our communities safe. That starts by making sure that terrorists, criminal domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill don't have easy access to purchase guns in our country.

Today, suspected terrorists can legally buy guns in our country. Individuals who are on the FBI's terrorist watch list can walk into a gun store, pass a background check, and walk out with a gun or the guns of their choosing—and they can do it legally.

Since 2004, more than 2,000 suspected terrorists were able to purchase guns. More than 90 percent of all suspected terrorists who tried to purchase guns in the last 11 years walked away with the weapon that they went in to buy.

Now, in the wake of the horrific attacks in Orlando, Congress must make it a priority to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of suspected terrorists. There is bipartisan legislation that would prohibit those on the terrorist watch list from being able to purchase firearms in our country. This bill is common sense. If you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun.

It is long past time for the Republican leadership to bring that bill up for a vote. We also need to pass my bipartisan bill to require background checks for all commercial gun sales.

Background checks are our first line of defense when it comes to stopping dangerous people from getting firearms. We know that background checks work. Every day, they stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun.

Unfortunately, in 34 States, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill can bypass a background check by purchasing guns online or at a gun show. This is a dangerous loophole that needs to be closed.

Yesterday, Senate Republicans blocked consideration of no fly, no buy legislation and a measure to strengthen and enhance background checks. Now the Republican House is going on with business as usual, without giving the American people a vote to help prevent gun violence in our country.

If the Republican leadership agrees that suspected terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill shouldn't be able to buy guns, they should give us a vote.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), the Member who represents Sandy Hook, where the Newtown tragedy took place.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to call on the U.S. Congress to call on this body, the United States House of Representatives, to do its job: to vote this week to keep guns out of the hands of would-be terrorists and to ensure that all commercial sales of weapons go through a background check.

Since the tragic shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School in my district in 2012, more than 100,000 Americans have lost their lives to gun violence.

Think about that. Think about a town in your district. Think about where your mother lives. I think about my hometown of Cheshire, with 30,000 people. Three Cheshires lost. Every single person—children, parents, teachers, grandparents—lost to gun violence. And this House does nothing.

In the 3½ years that I have been here, we have not been allowed one single, solitary vote to take commonsense, bipartisan steps to help prevent gun deaths in this country.

Congress' silence, our failure to act in this House, and the refusal of the leadership in this House time again to allow a vote is wrong, it is shameful, and it must stop.

Since my colleagues', Senator MURPHY and Senator BLUMENTHAL, historic, nearly 15-hour filibuster last week, Americans from all walks of life have risen up to say, ''Enough.''

□ 2000

Enough sons and daughters lost, enough families torn apart, enough of

absurd loopholes that make it easier for people on the FBI's terrorist watch list to buy guns than it is for your 16-year old to get a driver's license.

Reforms to stop terrorists from purchasing guns and extended background checks to all commercial sales are commonsense, bipartisan solutions to help prevent gun violence and to save lives. Outside of Washington, these ideas aren't the least bit controversial. In fact, they are simply common sense.

The American people get it. The overwhelming majority of Americans support the no fly, no buy rule that would allow us to close this absurd loophole that someone on the terrorist watch list can go in and legally purchase a gun anywhere in America, and to have background checks on each and every commercial sale.

Yesterday, on Monday, a majority of Senators decided to protect the interests of the gun lobby, rather than protecting the American people.

Now is the time for this House to lead. The House has remained silent for too long, for far too many acts of gun violence that have claimed the lives of tens of thousands of Americans.

It is unthinkable, unconscionable that this House would look to recess to celebrate the 4th of July, the freedom day, our Independence Day in this country, when we have yet to hold a single, solitary vote since Sandy Hook, when 100,000 Americans have died from gunshot wounds in 3½ years.

We must take up action. We must act this week. It is time for Congress to vote. It is time for Congress to act.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentlewoman for the compassion that she brings to this debate, and it is understandable. Having met with and spoken with many of the parents who lost their children at Sandy Hook Elementary School, to talk to them, and to have to tell them that yet another year has passed and the leadership in this Congress has refused, has refused to hold one single vote on any measure relating to gun violence, is just despicable and very, very sad.

I know that the gentlewoman from Connecticut goes home every weekend and talks with those parents and those community members who were shaken to their core to get that call that there was a shooting at an elementary school, and that their child was involved, and had to come down to that school and learn that their child was taken from them. It is unacceptable that we allow this to continue.

When Sandy Hook took place, I was asked by the minority leadership to chair a task force on gun violence prevention, and I took that on. I took it on for a couple of reasons: One, I know it had to be done; and two, I bring a unique perspective to this debate.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment. I am a gun owner. I am a hunter. I have vast experiences with firearms, including carrying a military-type assault weapon for the tour that I served in Vietnam. I consider myself a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and would do nothing to take an individual's Second Amendment right away from them. As I say, I support it strongly.

I also believe that, as a responsible gun owner, I, and all of my fellow responsible gun owners, have a responsibility to answer this call, to figure out how we can put on the books laws that—while protecting the Second Amendment, while protecting an individual's rights to own firearms and use firearms for target practicing, collecting, hunting, or self-defense, we have a responsibility to make sure we keep firearms out of the hands of people who shouldn't have firearms.

Criminals and the dangerously mentally ill should not be able to have firearms. They shouldn't be able to buy them, they shouldn't be able to own them, they shouldn't be able to use them. And surely this Congress can come together and figure out a way to make certain that this doesn't happen, to the best that we possibly can.

Now I will be the first to admit there is no bill in the world that we can pass that will solve every issue related to gun violence. But doggone it, we should try. We owe it to our constituents. We owe it to those who lost loved ones through gun violence, and we owe it to the responsible, law-abiding gun owners of this country to try.

Now I thought we had the makings of a good proposal when I sat down with my colleague and my friend from New York, Republican PETER KING, and we put together the legislation, commonly referred to as ''the King-Thompson Bill,'' to require that anyone who purchases a firearm through a commercial sale would be required to go through a background check.

You wouldn't think it would be necessary. You wouldn't think that anybody would want to sell a firearm to someone who may possibly be a danger to their community or to our society. But the fact of the matter is that there are people who sell firearms willy-nilly to anybody with the cash to buy them. And we need to step in and make sure that we stop willy-nilly from selling these firearms to criminals and the dangerously mentally ill, and that is what the King-Thompson bill does. It says that if you buy a firearm through a commercial sale, you have to have a background check.

Now anybody who buys a firearm in any of our 50 States through a licensed commercial dealer has to go through a background check. That is the floor. That is the minimum Federal law. Some States, however, don't go any further than that, which leaves this big loophole. It exempts individual sales, and some of those individual sales are commercial.

When you set up a table at a gun show and sell firearm after firearm after firearm, or when you go online and you list your firearms for sale as an individual, people can call and say: I want to buy that gun.

No background check needed because you are buying it from an individual. You can meet down in the parking lot of your local whatever store and you can make that transaction.

That needs to be stopped. Thirty-four States don't do anything about that. The King-Thompson legislation would do something about that. It would say that you have to first get a background check.

Now it is a bipartisan bill. As a matter of fact, there are 186 Members of this Congress who are coauthors of that bill. Five of them are Republicans.

Ninety percent of the American people believe that you should have background checks for commercial sale of firearms. Eighty-five percent of NRA members believe you should have background checks for firearms. They know that this is the first line of defense.

Again, it won't stop everything, but it does work. 170 felons a day, through the existing background check system, are stopped from buying firearms. We know it works.

Sadly, about 40 percent of all firearm purchases are done outside of federally licensed commercial sites, so 40 percent of the people who are buying guns today are able to avoid a background check. That is wrong. We ought to close that.

When we started the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, we met with everybody. I conducted the meetings. I conducted the hearings. We met with gun owner groups, we met with gun dealers, people who sell firearms, we met with gun experts, we met with people who are opposed to guns and people who are for guns. We heard from police, sheriffs, the Federal agency that deals with gun laws. We heard ad nauseam. We heard from the NRA. We brought everybody in, all the outside gun groups, to tell us what we needed to do. And without question, we came away from that with the understanding that background checks is the number one thing that we can do if we want to make a dent in this gun violence problem that we have. And we should have a vote on that bill.

Now, we know that it works. I told you that, but don't take my word for it. Look at the facts.

When Connecticut passed what they call their Permit to Purchase, which is a background check legislation, their State saw a 40 percent drop in homicides by firearms; 40 percent drop.

Now, conversely, at the same time, Missouri repealed Permit to Purchase, which led to a 25 percent increase in homicide by firearms.

Those numbers alone tell us that we need to do something. We need to do everything we can to keep guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them. And, again, if you are dangerously mentally ill, if you are a criminal, if you are a domestic abuser, or if you are a terrorist, you should not be able to have a firearm.

It is this Congress' responsibility to do what we can. Background checks

are our first line of defense to making sure these aforementioned groups don't get their hands on firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to drill down a little bit on the remarks of my good friend and colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, about why these two bills, why the no fly, no buy bill, and the expanded background checks, are so important and why they are so critical for this House to take votes on them this week; because keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people—and let's remember who these people are: convicted felons, domestic violence abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill, and the no fly, no buy would add would-be terrorists to that list—I think is something the overwhelming number of Americans and, frankly, people living anywhere in the world would agree would make sense.

Keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people not only makes sense, but it works. Since background checks were instituted, over 2 million purchases of guns were stopped by would-be buyers who submitted to a background check and it came back with a rejection saying, You are not authorized; and the gun was not sold. So it does work. It doesn't work perfectly, but it works.

And why does it matter that we expand background checks?

Well, let me tell you a little bit of something that I learned when I was elected to this job and the horrible murders happened in Newtown. I learned about the details of our present system.

When the background check system was put in 20 years ago, nobody bought guns on the Internet. In fact, most of us didn't buy much of anything on the Internet, but now we do. Now nearly 40 percent of the sales go through the Internet, and almost none of those go through background checks. That was surely not the intent of our colleagues 20 years ago. It just wasn't the way anyone bought anything.

Simply to keep up with the times, to reflect the way Americans purchase guns, ammunition, and everything else, we need to close the Internet loophole because it is not just gun shows, more importantly, it is the Internet.

But let's also understand what it means now to have this loophole. I am going to tell you the analogy that a former ATF official—Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms official—told me when I first started working on this issue, now 3½ years ago. He said this:

Elizabeth, imagine you arrive at the airport. People flew in today. Imagine you arrive at the airport, and there's somebody loaded up with a suicide vest and a gun standing next to you in line.

But there are two lines you can go to get on the plane. One of the lines is the one we're customarily used to. We put our things through, metal detectors, x-ray scanners, backscatter scanners.

But there's another line. The other line you can choose, and you could just walk right onto the plane, take your gear with you. And if that gear happens to be bombs, if it happens to be a suicide vest, it if happens to be guns, you could just walk right onto the plane.

Now, I think we could all agree that that would be incredibly dangerous, incredibly irresponsible, senseless. And yet, that is the system we have right now for guns.

□ 2015

If you are a terrorist, if you are a domestic violence abuser, if you are dangerously mentally ill, and, most importantly, if you are a convicted felon, all you have to do is go online, or all you have to do is go to the gun show and go to the booth that doesn't list that it is a federally licensed firearms dealer.

Folks, that is just too easy. It is too easy for the bad guys to get their hands on guns. It is up to us to take action, the simple action of passing these two important pieces of legislation to close these loopholes.

Now, some will say it is too hard, this Congress is too gridlocked, and we can't get anything done, but I want to tell you what hard is. Hard is what Mark Barden does every day. Mark Barden's son, Daniel, was murdered in his classroom 3½ years ago, and Mark Barden gets up every morning. He tells me he can't even go and have breakfast with the rest of the family because that was his special time with his son. He can't do that now. It is too painful. So he gets up, he goes out of the house, he makes phone calls, and he does email because he can't be alone in his house with the rest of the family sleeping because his son is no longer there.

Mark Barden now is one of the growing number of American citizen activists, because this Congress has failed to act, these American heroes who fly around the country, pound the pavement, go to churches, synagogues, mosques, meet in schools, and go to chambers of commerce and plead with their fellow Americans to pressure this body, the House of Representatives, the people's House, to take action to defend the people.

What we do is not that hard, not compared to what Mark Barden does every day, not compared to the heartache of those in Chicago where you have dozens dying on a given weekend. Folks, it is not that hard. We can take the votes. We should take the heat, and we should act to save lives.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

She is absolutely correct. Our job is not that hard. Could you imagine that? On this floor, we are all parents; we have kids. Could you imagine losing your child? You send them to school, where they are supposed to be safe, and get the call that your son or your daughter has been murdered at school? That is hard. That is difficult.

What we are doing is not hard. It certainly shouldn't be hard for the Republican leadership to allow us to have a vote on gun violence prevention legislation that would help prevent these things from happening. They just happen too often. Every day, 31 people are murdered by someone using a gun. Every day, 151 people are shot in an assault in our country. That is hard.

What is the Republican leadership afraid of? You are afraid to take a vote? Are you more afraid than the people that were in that nightclub in Orlando hiding in the restrooms hoping they wouldn't be the next one who was murdered? Are you more afraid than those children in the classroom in Newtown, Connecticut?

Give us a vote. Let's address this issue. It is shameful. There is nothing to be afraid of. We were elected to come here and do a job. Give us a vote.

Our Gun Violence Prevention Task Force I mentioned heard from every imaginable interest on this issue. We took what we heard, and we put it in this legislation.

The King-Thompson background check legislation addressed a whole list of issues other than just the background check provision. They were issues that were brought to us primarily by the NRA.

The NRA asked for specific things. They asked us to make sure that there was due process for veterans adjudicated as mentally defective before losing their firearms rights. We put that in the bill. There was a request to clarify that the submissions to the NICS system don't violate HIPAA, the medical protections for patients. We put that in the bill.

The NRA was concerned that the length of time that you have to wait in order to get your firearm after you passed a background check was too long, so we put in place a provision that reduces the purchase proceed timeline. Right now it is 3 days. Eventually, it would phase into being 24 hours, with the idea that the NICS system would have more complete records because the bill also allows the States to get grant funding to allow them to better get their information into the NICS, and our bill requires the Federal courts to put records into the NICS system.

The NRA said that hunting buddies shouldn't have to go through the background check. If you are at the duck club, your buddy wants to sell a shotgun, you want to buy it, you have been hunting buddies for a long time and you know one another, they said they shouldn't have to go through a background check, so we put a hunting buddies known person exemption into our bill.

There was great concern that this bill would lead to some sort of Big Brother list of any gun owners. Not only is that nonsense, but we took their concern and we raised them one. We added a 15-year felony for the improper storage of records by anyone in the government.

We also heard concerns that members of the armed services were conflicted.

They have a permanent home address and a permanent duty station request, and that complicated their effort to own and purchase firearms. We put a provision in the bill that said members of our armed services can count their home and their permanent duty station as their residences. We took care of all of these concerns. These are things that the NRA said they have been trying to fix for years. Well, we fixed it in the King-Thompson bill.

At the same time, we take a step to fix this terrible problem we have where people can buy guns without having a background check—the dangerously mentally ill, criminals, domestic abusers, or terrorists.

This is a good bill, as I said, with 186 bipartisan coauthors. This is a bill that should be passed. No one knows that more than the gentleman from New York, Congressman ISRAEL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my friend. More than anything, I want to thank him for his leadership in being able to bring people on both sides of this aisle together on the commonsense notion that, if you can't buy a plane ticket, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. If you are on the terrorist watch list, you shouldn't be able to avail yourself of a weapon.

Mr. Speaker, when 20 children were murdered in Sandy Hook, the district of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I really believed that Congress was going to do something. What did we do? Nothing. When Americans were murdered in San Bernardino, I said, well, this time we are going to do something. What did we do then? Nothing. We do moments of silence, and we do not act. Enough silence.

We are here to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and protect and defend the lives of the American people, and to allow lives to be mowed down, to allow our fellow citizens to be slaughtered and say that the solution to this is another moment of silence is unconscionable.

We came into session tonight, Mr. Speaker, and on Friday, the Speaker of the House will bang the gavel down and send Congress home for a week. In that week, so many more Americans will be killed by gun violence—so many more. To allow this Congress to take a week's vacation and do nothing on gun violence is unconscionable.

No bill, no break, Mr. Speaker. No bill, no break.

If the Speaker won't allow us to even vote on a bill, then we shouldn't be allowed to take a break and go home to our districts. For those who decide that they are going to leave here without even raising their voices in support of a vote, I don't know how you will defend that decision when you go home. I don't know how you will look your constituents in the eye and say: I have a week off, and I have done nothing to protect and defend my constituents.

I understand there are some real, fundamental, and profound differences on various potential solutions to gun violence. What this gentleman has done is brought us to common ground. No fly, no buy: 80 percent of the American people support no fly, no buy; 70 percent of NRA members support no fly, no buy; the vast majority of Republicans support no fly, no buy, along with Democrats and Independents.

The reason there is support for this bill is not only is it common sense, but as the gentleman just demonstrated, he and his bipartisan cosponsor, a Republican from New York, have worked out so many areas of disagreement to areas of agreement.

When the vast majority of the American people agree that terrorists should not be able to easily purchase guns, then the people's House should listen to the people. We should pass no fly, no buy, and we need to do it by the time we recess. No bill, no break, Mr. Speaker. I hope that our colleagues understand the importance of that.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his spot-on comments, passionate comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of California (Mr. RUIZ). He is a colleague of mine from California. As an emergency room doctor, Dr. RAUL RUIZ not only understands that we need to pass this legislation, but he has seen the carnage that has come in for his care.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Congressman THOMPSON, very much for his leadership and championing gun violence prevention in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in demanding that Speaker RYAN allow us to vote on measures to prevent gun violence before we adjourn at the end of this week.

Last week, we watched in horror as 49 of our LGBT brothers and sisters had their lives cut short at the hands of a firearm. This is not the first terrible slaughter we have witnessed as a nation. These mass shootings continue as Congress does nothing to act and nothing to keep our constituents safe.

As an emergency physician, I have taken care of too many patients injured by guns. I have had the gut-wrenching experience of telling parents, families, and friends that their loved one was killed by a gun. I have taken care of people who have been victims—innocent victims—of drive-by shootings. I have taken care of victims who have been shot by their spouse in a domestic dispute. I have taken care of victims who have been caught as bystanders in a violent crime at a store, and I have had the terrible experience of having to tell a mother that her child—her young, adolescent child—was killed in the streets. It is not something that we can ever be fully prepared for but we do way too often in our country.

These are needless deaths—needless deaths—because there is an opportunity right here and right now to curb the trend of violence in our country. This gun violence must end.

This week, we are calling on the Speaker to allow a vote so our constituents know where exactly we stand. There are several bills out there that would make a difference, including the bipartisan King-Thompson no fly, no buy that keeps guns out of the hands of terrorists and expands and strengthens background check systems.

If we can't agree on the fact that terrorists should not get their hands on guns in our country, then it is a political shame on the parts that are beholden to political interests.

Let's vote on the Zero Tolerance for Domestic Abusers Act, which would prohibit individuals convicted of stalking or domestic abuse from purchasing or owning a firearm; and let's vote on the bipartisan Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act, another bill of Congressman THOMPSON, which would improve the criminal history records systems, which would help our law enforcement and which would mandate that all commercial gun sales utilize this background check system.

□ 2030

It is not like we don't have ideas. It is not like we don't have a path forward to curb gun violence in America. There is no one cure-all.

If we take a public health approach, if we reduce the risk of the multifaceted aspects of gun violence, then we will reduce the risk of gun violence. By reducing the risk of gun violence, we reduce the incidence of gun violence in America.

Let us vote so that terrorists and violent criminals cannot access firearms, so we can prevent another Orlando. Let us vote to end gun violence to keep the American people safe.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in calling for no bill and no break.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments and for his service not only as a distinguished Member of this body, but his time as a medical professional. Sadly, he had to witness the carnage that comes about because of gun violence. I applaud his effort to help us reduce gun violence, to pass some commonsense laws that protect the Second Amendment.

As I said earlier, as a gun owner and as a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, I think that is absolutely necessary. I think it is absolutely irresponsible for any gun owner to not stand up and be counted when it comes to passing commonsense public safety measures, such as no fly, no buy and background checks for the commercial sale of firearms.

I thank my colleagues who joined with me this evening in this Special Order. You heard from everyone who spoke that moments of silence are not enough. We have had 30 moments of silence since the tragedy at Sandy Hook. It is not enough.

We need to stop being silent, we need to speak up, and we need to do our job. We need to show the courage that our constituents have placed in us. We need to do our job to make sure that when parents send their kids to school, they can be reasonably assured that their kids are going to be safe. We need to do our job so that when people go into a church to pray, they don't have to worry about some maniac coming in and shooting them during their prayer hour. We need to do our job to make sure that when people are relaxing and recreating in a club, or wherever it might be, they can feel reasonably assured that their Congress has taken steps to keep guns out of the hands of people who are criminals and people who are dangerously mentally ill, domestic abusers, or terrorists.

It is time to do our job. It is time to stop with the moments of silence. It is time to stand up, show some courage, and pass some commonsense, bipartisan gun violence prevention legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

TELLING SURVIVORS STORIES THROUGH THEIR OWN WORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about what occurred at Stanford University a couple of weeks ago and a follow-up to some of the events that occurred after that.

The victim in that case gave a powerful victim impact statement. It was 7,200 words long. Last week, 18 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, led by JACKIE SPEIER from California, read the statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: JACKIE SPEIER from California, KATHERINE CLARK from Massachusetts, DAVID CICILLINE from Rhode Island, NIKI TSONGAS from Massachusetts, MAXINE WATERS from California, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey, JUDY CHU from California, ANNA ESHOO from California, MARK TAKANO from California, DEBBIE DINGELL from Michigan, MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio, TULSI GABBARD from Hawaii, TED POE from Texas, ERIC SWALWELL from California, LORETTA SANCHEZ from California, SUSAN DAVIS from California, PAUL GOSAR from Arizona, and ANN MCLANE KUSTER from New Hampshire. It took almost an hour to read her compelling statement about what happened to her when the rapist, Brock Turner, committed this crime against her.

After the crime was committed, there was a trial. The case was not, as we say in the system, plea bargained. There was no plea agreement. It was an actual trial. After the trial, the judge assessed punishment for three felony crimes that he committed—that being Brock Turner. The judge assessed punishment as a misdemeanor of 6 months in jail, which means that Brock Turner will spend probably 90 days in jail, a half of a semester, for the crime that he committed against the victim.

As a former prosecutor for 8 years trying these type of cases and a judge in Houston for 22 years hearing only criminal felony cases, I have seen historically how devastating the crime of sexual assault is. We, as a community, need to understand how victims are impacted by this crime.

Obviously, the judge in the Stanford case didn't get it. You can read what he said. It is obvious that he was more concerned about the feelings of the criminal and his future than he was about the victim. He was almost dismissive of her statement that she read into the record.

There is a movement that is being started by a Stanford law professor, Michele Landis Dauber, whom I got to meet last week—very impressive, Mr. Speaker. She gets it. She understands about sexual assault, this crime especially at Stanford, and the impact on the victim.

She is using a recall system that is in California that a public official can be recalled if there are enough signatures on a petition to get the recall on the ballot. She is feisty, and she is going to get it done.

I admire the State of California for having recall of public officials. This is a perfect example of why other States ought to have recall of public officials, especially judges who don't get it right. In my opinion, the judge should be removed from office.

After I spoke on the House floor, and then 19 Members spoke a couple of days later on the House floor about this crime, I have received hundreds—hundreds—of contacts from sexual assault victims throughout the country, primarily by email. Some of these sexual assault survivors have never told anybody, according to them, what happened to them years ago or of recent years. Many of them just didn't get the justice that they deserved.

They didn't tell for a lot of reasons, mainly because they were ashamed. Rape survivors—God bless them—think sometimes the crime is their fault. And it is not, Mr. Speaker. It is never the fault of the victim. When a sexual assault occurs, it is the fault of the criminal every time—not most of the time, every time. Judges need to understand that.

The justice system needs to work for victims of crime just like it works for the accused citizen. The same Constitution that protects defendants protects victims of crime as well.

We have come a long way since the days I was prosecuting. Once again, California has led the national movement for victims' rights. My friend JIM COSTA from California and I head up the Victims' Rights Caucus. He was the sponsor of the Three Strikes sentencing law that passed in California.

California has a history of looking out for victims. I commend California for that. I know that may shock you, Mr. Speaker, but I commend them for getting it right when it comes to victims.

In this particular case, it all went wrong. The victim articulated it quite well in her statement. I hope every Member of Congress reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the statement of that woman is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Just read it. And, more importantly, if you are a dad, read it to your sons as well. I will come back to that in a minute.

I have four kids—three girls and a boy. I have 11 grandkids; 7 of them are girls. I sure don't want my kids and my grandkids to continue to grow up in a society that doesn't really take care of crime victims and is dismissive to them.

Of the many survivors that wrote me, several bravely offered to share their stories with me. I am here to read some of those stories. Not all of them, just a few. Some have asked me not to give their names. Some are anonymous. Some said it is okay for me to say what their name is. I am not going to tell their whole name. I am just not going to do that. I think they deserve that privacy. I hope, by sharing these words, the world will see what outstanding resilience these few sexual assault victims have had over the years.

Jennifer writes:

It was January 2004. I was 24 years of age. I am a divorced mother of three elementary school children studying to become a preschool teacher. The man I loved came home drunk after wrecking my car. My children were upstairs asleep. He beat me, beat my head against the cement floor, and then he raped me as I tried to stay quiet, so quiet, so still, so he would leave and no one upstairs would wake up. He did finally leave.

My mother said that since I loved him, it wasn't rape. Because I got involved with a man who would do that, it was my fault, and I couldn't very well make him lose his job because of my poor judgment. I was young. I didn't know. To this day, I blame myself for letting it happen, even though now I know that none of it was my fault.

Because of that night, I have post-traumatic stress disorder. My body remembers, even if my mind doesn't know all of the details.

After reading the speech you made, I told my new husband about what happened to me. This was the first time I have ever told him. We have been together for 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to Jennifer's mother, Jennifer's mother was wrong. It was not Jennifer's fault that she fell in love with a worthless guy. And the sexual assault was certainly not her fault. It was his fault. He should have been held accountable for what he did. Jennifer still suffers to this day for what that individual did.

The rape—and we use the word ''rape,'' and we use ''sexual assault.'' ''Sexual assault'' is a relatively new term. It used to be called ''rape'' because that is a specific type of sexual assault. Sexual assault is broader. But rape is never the fault of the victim, and neither is sexual assault.

The defendant always has an excuse to blame the victim: ''Well, she came

on to me,'' or, ''It was what she was wearing,'' or, ''She was drunk,'' or, ''She was under the influence of narcotics''; ''She didn't resist''; ''She didn't scream''; ''She didn't tell me no''; ''She didn't run for help.'' The defendants in these cases always blame the victim. But rape is not the fault of a victim. ''No'' means no.

If people out there in America want to join in on this conversation, they can use the #survivorsspeak, and just keep discussing this issue because I think we should discuss this issue.

Here we have a victim, ''I said no.'' Saying ''no'' means no. It doesn't mean maybe. It doesn't mean yes. ''No'' always means no.

So if folks want to join in on that, I would encourage them—#survivorsspeak.

That is Jennifer's story.

This story was written by a family member because of the age of the victim. She is anonymous, of course:

Twenty-six years ago, a 6-year-old was raped in Mercedes, Texas. The rapist got his fix as he pleased. The pervert? Well, he is still on the loose. He is a pedophile, a rapist, and a scumbag, yet he still walks the streets. His victim is now 30 years of age. She still has post-traumatic stress disorder. She still cries, is depressed, and relives her tragedy each day. Thank Congress for what they are trying to do for this crime.

This is a case where we know who the perpetrator was, and for some reason we don't know, he got away with it—maybe because of the age of the victim; maybe she didn't want to testify. We don't know.

□ 2045

He got away with it, and the victim still suffers now, 24 years later; but what happened to her when she was 6 years of age?

Christina writes this:

As a victim of rape 25 years ago, I am disappointed to see that we really haven't made progress as a Nation or a people in changing the attitude toward rape victims. It is time to recognize the lifetime impact that rape has on a victim. It affects every part of your being. It is time to stop the line of questioning that the victim is subjected to—the line of questions that insinuate: Well, what did you do to cause this?

I have been at the courthouse. I see how criminal defense lawyers ask a question in cases like this. Usually, the defense is: the individual. It is the fault of the victim. It is not the fault of the rapist. That is one of the defenses—to go after the victims. Attack them.

She continues:

My assailant was a friend of a friend. It still causes me to be overly guarded with relationships. I still question my judgment. On every new date, the first thought is: Where is my escape route? Then it progresses to: What are the signs that I am ignoring that I should be aware of that would harm me? I am aware that this is an abnormal thought process, but more than 25 years later, it is what I need to do to feel safe again—a lifetime of grief.

Aja writes this:

My name is Aja. I was raped. I have not received any sort of justice for the act committed against me. I have stayed silent about this for nearly 5 years, and, today, that ends. Today, I am no longer a victim of crime, but I am a survivor. I am not alone. I am not my past. I am not meant to stay silent. I actually matter.

Good for Aja.

Hillary writes this:

I am writing you so my voice and so many others may be heard. I was 19 when I was drugged and raped. To this day, I will never know how many individuals raped me. I may have no memory of the act, but it doesn't change the outcome. I was unconscious and never was given a chance to say no. I will always remember the pain, seeing the bruises that covered the inside of my thighs. My underwear was ripped from my body and tied together and put back on. I never want to see those clothes again.

I reported my rape, but never received justice, like so many other rape victims. I went through humiliating questions from the police. I felt so much pain and humiliation again at the hospital, through the pregnancy tests, the STD test, and the HIV test. Pictures were taken of my bruises on my body, and I felt so much shame. When the rape kit was done, I cried. It was painful. I felt ruined. I was given a lifelong sentence while he and others walk free.

I live with the feeling of shame. I could not smile. I live, even to this day, with nightmares. I blame myself because—maybe, if I had not taken that drink. He took my voice for years—a piece of me he did not deserve. I went through lots of therapy for depression, but I will live in fear no more. My body was taken without asking, but I have a voice now, and it will not be silenced.

I tell my story so others won't feel alone. We didn't ask for this. We need to make sure that no more victims are made to feel like they did something wrong. I did nothing wrong. I didn't violate him, but I carry the scars of what he did. I stand with every victim out there. I cried while writing this letter. It is the first time I have given my voice to be heard. Thank you again for giving us a voice to fight with.

She is thanking all Members of Congress who have spoken out against this type of crime.

This is another anonymous individual. I have three more, including this one.

Mr. POE, I can only hope that your words will be heeded and that the wrong will be made right, just a tiny bit, by this victim. From personal experience, the nightmares never stop. Not even after my rapist was killed in prison did the nightmares stop. I still see his face in the dark. I can hear his voice appraising my body like I was a cow at an auction. I have carried this burden since I was 7 years old, and it can't ever be fixed, but we can stop it from being the fate of others by making the punishment so severe, the crime is not an option.

She probably wouldn't have agreed with the 6-month sentence that the Stanford judge gave the defendant who will only do 90 days.

Another anonymous letter:

In college, a man broke into my apartment and brutally raped, beat, and pistol-whipped me.

It is hard to read this, Mr. Speaker.

He sodomized me with his gun. I have horrible flashbacks and can barely live a day when I don't have anxiety or panic attacks and the wish just to die and end it all from the emotional, physical, and psychological damage that he did to me.

You give some of us hope, and I want to sincerely thank you and other Members of Congress for standing up for us rape victims. I am honored for you to share my story to help others, but I want to remain anonymous because I still fear my attacker even though I don't know his name. My rapist knows my name. He stalked me prior to the rape. Thank you for taking the time to write me back.

The last case, Lauren's, was a case I actually tried. I tried the person who assaulted her and her sister. It was in 1997. Lauren was the age of 11, and her stepsister was 9 years of age. They were repeatedly molested, not by a stranger or by a friend, but by someone closer—their grandfather. He molested them several times. This happened 20 years ago next year, and Lauren still can't talk much about it. She reached out to my office to tell us that sexual assault stays with you for life. In her case, the individual was convicted. He received a 10-year sentence in one case and a 5-year sentence in the other, and they were stacked on top of each other, which means he had to do 15 years in the penitentiary of the State of Texas.

We have done some good things over the years. We have done some good things in Congress. The Justice for All Act strengthens the rights of victims of crime in the criminal justice process, increasing their access to restitution and the reauthorization of victims' notification grants. It takes steps to reduce the rape kit backlog. It expands the use of sexual assault nurse examiners in underserved communities.

I have been around so long that, when I started prosecuting cases, we didn't have a rape kit. We didn't know what that was. We certainly didn't have DNA. But we have rape kits now because some wonderful doctors have figured this out, some of them at the Texas Children's Hospital in Houston. It is a forensic kit that is taken of the sexual assault victim. These items are analyzed and tracked through DNA to find out who the rapist was; but right now, in our country, we have rape kits that are sitting on the shelves in police departments throughout the country that are gathering dust. People just can't get around to solving these crimes. They make all kinds of excuses: We don't have the money; we just need more help.

The bottom line is that we are denying justice to sexual assault victims for the failure to analyze these rape kits. We need to analyze the rape kits, but it cuts both ways, Mr. Speaker. Some of these rape kits, after they are analyzed, exonerate people in the penitentiary. Get it done. Solve this problem of the backlog of rape kits. There is no excuse for the Justice Department, for the FBI, for any local law enforcement agency not to analyze those sexual assault kits right away.

You see, when the crime is committed, Mr. Speaker, the system works in such a way that we don't let the victims forget about what happened to them because they may have to testify,

and they can't get on with their lives, so to speak, until the rape kit is analyzed, and the idea that one has to wait a year or 2 years before we know who committed this crime is abuse of the system. The system is abusing the victim again. Like I said, it may exonerate an offender who is in the penitentiary.

So no more excuses. It needs to be a priority of police departments. Analyze the sexual assault kits, analyze that DNA, because it really is good evidence in the courtroom to convict the guilty and exonerate the innocent; but you can't get to that point and the victims can't get to trial until the sexual assault kit is analyzed. They have to continue to remember this. They can't forget it, not that they would forget it, but they can't get on with their lives.

The same thing is true about postponing these cases. So many judges take a sexual assault case and: Ah, we will postpone this case. We are going to try some slip-and-fall case instead.

Courts in the United States, by the legislative authority of the legislatures, should make a priority of sexual assault cases, especially of minor children, and put them in the line first to get their day in court. Some States do it—some don't—but that is one easy fix that we could do.

Of course, this law, the Justice for All Act, protects VAWA funding streams that are critical to crime prevention, and I mentioned about DNA testing.

I mentioned JIM COSTA—a great American. This issue is a bipartisan issue. We have 80 in our Victims' Rights Caucus—40 Republicans and 40 Democrats. Every year, we have this fight with the appropriators. We are in the appropriations season. There was a great law that was passed by Congress—sponsored, I believe, by Ronald Reagan or whoever—that said this:

When a criminal is convicted in Federal court, the judge may impose a fee, and that fee goes into what is called the Victims of Crime Act fund. VOCA is what it is called. God bless those Federal judges. They are nailing these criminals, because more and more money every year is going into the Victims of Crime Act fund. That fund is to be used for victims of crime, including for services, restoration, counseling—all of those good things that we now do for victims that we didn't used to do; but here is the problem:

More money than ever before is coming into the Victims of Crime Act fund. Right now, my understanding is there is $9 billion in the fund. Now, this isn't taxpayer money. This is money that criminals have paid toward the rent on the courthouse. They have paid for the crimes they have committed, plus their sentences, and it is a fund that is supposed to go to crime victims. It is a great idea. The problem is Congress—us. This has been going on for years. It doesn't appropriate all of the money every year that came in the previous year. Only about 30 percent of it is appropriated to crime victims' organizations, and many of these organizations are barely keeping their lights on.

I am no appropriator. I am not a CPA. I am a lawyer. The appropriators say: Well, we can't spend that money because we need it as an offset for other spending in other programs.

It is not for other programs. It is not taxpayer money. What JIM COSTA and I have been trying to do since we came in here in 2005 is to say: What goes in this year comes out next year. Spend it all. We don't need to have a rainy day fund because the money keeps going up every year because Federal judges are making defendants pay into this fund.

Once again, it belongs to victims of crime, but it is administered by the Justice Department. It is no reflection on this administration. It has been going on for years. The Justice Department just hangs onto it because the appropriators don't spend it all and appropriate all of the money, as I said, because they want to use it as an offset.

□ 2100

The country and some judges, like the one at Stanford, have to get their mindset right today in 2016. Sexual assault is a crime we don't talk much about. It is just kind of distasteful, so we don't talk about it. We talk about other things.

Yet, these sexual assault victims live quiet lives of despair. And I have known a lot over the years. Some of them keep in contact with me. They just call to check in. And they don't ever get over it, Mr. Speaker. We would hope that they would. We would hope they get their lives together. You know they become survivors, but, emotionally, many of them just don't get over it for a lot of reasons; because they are ashamed, their mom told them it was their fault, whatever.

We need to make it real clear that Congress is on the side of sexual assault victims. Make no mistake about it, we are on their side because really we are their only voice. We are it. If we don't speak for them and help legislation forward to protect them, it doesn't get done. So we have a lot to do.

One thing that I would like to mention, the father and the mother of the rapist gave a statement to the judge, and I read those statements. I would like to talk about the father. He basically blamed the victim for the conduct of his son. He is wrong. And the problem is he actually believes it is her fault. He didn't just say that to try to protect his son. He believes it is her fault. That is what is really bad.

Most of us who are males in this House, we have sons. I do have one. I have grandsons. We have an obligation to raise our sons in accordance with basic human rights and explain to them when they are very young that there are some things you just can't do. You are going to be punished for it, but also it is wrong.

Sexual assault is one of those. It is wrong. You cannot do that. We need to explain that, because we have a generation of young males—every generation of young males has to be reeducated.

We have that obligation in our families to educate our sons that because you think you are somebody, you are not going to get off if you do that crime, whether you are an athlete, whether you come from pedigree, whether you are rich, famous, whatever. We need to explain to our sons that it is morally wrong to sexually assault a person under any circumstances because ''no'' always means no. It is not the fault of the victim.

So I would encourage dads to do this. This doesn't cost any money. It doesn't cost any legislation, but it is a moral obligation we have as fathers. I think if fathers did a better job—I have said this a long time—if fathers did a better job, we would have fewer young males at the courthouse; because most of the people who showed up at the courthouse when I was a judge, they were young males. Most of them were under 25 years of age and they were males. And it is not because the women get away with it. It is because young males commit most of the crime. We have that obligation, and I encourage fathers to do that.

I want to talk about two more cases that I was involved in. I tried this case as a prosecutor, and this was a senior citizen. Sadie was her first name. And in the trial, the victim had to state what happened to her. She would never say ''rape.'' She certainly never said ''sexual assault'' because we didn't use that term, but she kept testifying from the witness stand.

What happened to you?

And she said: It is a fate worse than death.

Well, can you be a little more detailed?

No. It is a fate worse than death.

And we went through this for a little bit, and she kept saying that: It is a fate worse than death.

She eventually said enough of the right words to meet the legal qualification for rape. And I asked her at the trial: Why do you keep saying it is a fate worse than death?

I don't know if you have ever heard that before or not.

And she said: It is real simple. When you die, you die once. When this crime is committed against you, you die every day. It is a fate worse than death.

That is the way sexual assault victims view this crime, and that is the way the law ought to view this crime. To many, it is a fate worse than death. And she had it perfectly because it is a fate worse than death.

The last case I will talk about is one that I prosecuted as well. This individual, the victim in this case—I won't use her name because her family still lives in Houston—she was leaving one of our major universities and driving home to a town north of Houston, and all the lights turned on on the dashboard.

She is having car trouble, and she pulled into a service station. She thought it was open. It was not. She came in contact with who she thought was the service station attendant. He was not the service station attendant. I am not going to mention his name; he doesn't deserve it.

He kidnapped her. He had a gun. He took her from this area, put her into some woods, sexually assaulted her, beat her up, and she survived because she was a remarkable lady. In fact, my understanding now after the trial, the defendant was mad that she did survive.

Anyway, he is tried. He is convicted by a jury of 12 right-thinking Houstonians who convicted the defendant. In Texas we have, in some cases, jury sentencing. And the jury sentenced this individual, this rapist, to 99 years in the Texas penitentiary. That was the maximum. He deserved every minute of it.

Now, we would hope everything would be okay and that life would go on. Bad guy, outlaw, goes to prison; sexual assault victim gets justice in court. But it doesn't work that way because that is not life.

The first thing that happened was she started abusing alcohol and then other narcotics. Her husband left her. And a year—maybe 2 years—after the crime, I get a call from her mother, and she tells me that her daughter has taken her own life and she left a note that says: I'm tired of running from the criminal in my nightmares.

See, she got the death penalty for what somebody did to her.

In the cases that I mentioned tonight and the many, many others that we have all received since last week, there are a lot of victim survivors. And we really are judged by the way we treat innocent folks in our community; not the rich, not the famous, not the athletes, but by the way we treat the innocent, the kids, the people who have no voice in our justice system, except Congress. So we speak for them, and we need to speak for them as well.

So I would remind the people that are out listening to this to use the #survivorsspeak and weigh in on this conversation if they want.

Mr. Speaker, this subject, as I mentioned at the outset, is one that we sometimes don't want to talk about, but we can't ignore it ever, not anymore, not today, not in this town, or any town in America. That is why the Stanford judge needs to go, and that is why I commend the folks in California for having a recall petition.

Judges need to get their head on straight to know they have to get it right every time when it comes to justice. The scales of justice are a balancing act. Justice for defendants, but also justice for victims and survivors of crime, because rape is never the fault of the victim. And when a rapist commits a crime against usually a woman or a child, that rapist is stealing the very soul of that victim because that is what happens sometimes. Let us not forget that.

And that is just the way it is.

WE ARE ALL EMILY DOE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Judge POE for his eloquent words tonight. I appreciate the bipartisan sentiment.

I rise tonight in solidarity with my courageous colleagues from across the country who spoke last week and, as Judge POE joined us, we read the eloquent words of the survivor in the Stanford University case.

We rise tonight to show our continuing support for the woman known to the world as Emily Doe and to join with all of our sisters at Stanford and on college campuses and in communities around the Nation with one simple message to America: We are all Emily Doe.

I am going to start my remarks tonight 40 years ago on a cold winter night at a prestigious college campus—this time on the East Coast—I was an 18-year-old student. I was going to a dance. The dance was at a fraternity, and I intended to enjoy the evening with my friends. We danced. We listened to music. We enjoyed the evening and we enjoyed the party until one young man assaulted me in a crude and insulting way, and I ran alone into the cold, dark night. I have never forgotten that night. I was filled with shame, regret, humiliation while he was egged on by everyone at that party standing by.

Several years later, I was working as a legislative assistant right here on Capitol Hill, and I was assaulted again, this time by a distinguished guest of the United States Congress. I was 23 years old. And as Judge POE referenced tonight, I did not say a word to anyone. And, in fact, until I wrote these words to share with you tonight, I had never told anyone this story. My family didn't know, my husband, my children, my friends. I was 23.

A few months after that evening, I was walking home from dinner at a diner right here on Capitol Hill. If I named it, you all would know it well. I was mugged. I was grabbed in the dark, and I fought free. And when I broke free, I ran, again, alone into the cold, dark night.

I tell these stories tonight on the floor of the United States Congress not because they are remarkable or unique. Sadly, I tell these stories because they are all too common.

You see, all of us—Members of Congress, college students, soldiers and sailors, mothers and sisters—we are all Emily Doe. And the message we hear and the message that the court sent in Stanford is that we are not safe, we are not secure, and we do not deserve to be free, free from sexual assault, free from rape, free from rude, crude, obnoxious offensive assaults on our bodies, on our beings, on ourselves.

What we hear on college campuses, on military bases, in the workplace, and in the courthouse is that he has a future; he has potential; he was drunk; he didn't mean any harm; he just wanted to have fun, to get some action, and then get on with his life.

□ 2115

What about her? What about her future? The student, the soldier, the sailor, the mother, the sister? We have been silent for too long. We also have potential. We also have a future. We are all Emily Doe, and tonight we will not be silent anymore.

Tonight we stand together—Republicans and Democrats, mothers and sisters—from across the country to take a stand for liberty and justice for all. We will fight for consequences for the 3 percent of men on college campuses and in our communities who are sexual predators and a menace to women everywhere. We will fight for bystander education and sexual assault prevention.

For the 97 percent of men on college campuses and in our communities who can be part of the solution, join us in taking a stand against sexual assault. We will reward college campuses that are open, transparent, and not only change their policies and programs but actually hold the perpetrators accountable and provide real and effective counseling and support for those students who have been assaulted.

And we will impose sanctions on college administrators who fail to act, fail to change, fail to prevent, fail to protect. Every student deserves to be safe; every student deserves to be secure, to live her life and to live her future. So remember, tonight we are all Emily Doe. She has given us our voice, and we will not be silent any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), my good friend and colleague.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for her personal story. It is moving, it is courageous, and it makes a difference. We so appreciate your words because your story is our story, and it is the story of our daughters, our nieces, our granddaughters, and ourselves.

Approximately 20 percent of women who go to college will be sexually assaulted, and according to the Department of Justice and the Center for Public Policy, 95 percent of those women will not report their crimes because they don't think they will be believed. They think they will be humiliated and shamed.

As Emily Doe said so eloquently and brutally frankly in her statement to her rapist Brock Turner, the judicial system and institutions will blame the victim. She had her consent questioned even though she was unconscious.

Another college student recently in the news in Massachusetts went to WPI, and when she was lured to a rooftop and raped by a university security guard, she was questioned in the courtroom on her so-called risky behavior of drinking alcohol, not getting off the elevator when the guard followed her on, and that she had ignored training on personal safety.

Recently at Harvard, an alumni group president of an elite men's club offered that the suggestion of making the club coed was not a good one because it would potentially increase sexual assault at the club, not decrease it.

Alcohol, trusting security guards, the mere presence of women, none of it justifies rape. Alcohol highlights the deeply rooted ideas of entitlement that we have, and in rapists—and in, too frequently, mass shooters—it is what Michael Kimmel terms ''aggrieved entitlement,'' a powerful toxic world view that justifies violent action against children, women, elderly, or the LGBTQ community because the perpetrator believes they can act with impunity.

So how do we begin to change this horrifying landscape? First, we need to collect data. We need to understand who is perpetrating these crimes to understand how we can get to better solutions. A lack of accurate capture and analysis for understanding perpetration has caused us to not be able to frame the questions for better solutions.

Second, we have to look at funding. Cuts to social services for domestic violence and sexual assault are ones that we simply can't afford in our very first line of defense and the funding that is so necessary to build communities. We also need to talk to our children about sexual assault. A No More study revealed 73 percent of parents with children under the age of 18 have never talked to them about sexual assault, domestic violence, or even alcohol. And we certainly aren't talking about double standards, power imbalances, bias, and bigotry.

Finally, we need to look at our institutions: higher education—our colleges and universities—community policing, and our criminal justice system. We must enable transparency and accountability and counteract our deep cultural questions and questioning and disbelief of victims and stereotypes that enable entitlements to flourish violently.

The work that Representative KUSTER has called for tonight begins with us, and I thank her again for her leadership and her bravery and her friendship not just to me, but to all women.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CLARK.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), my good friend and colleague.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman KUSTER for organizing this Special Order this evening and for bringing attention to such a critical issue. I also want to thank Congresswoman CLARK for her story as well. I appreciate so much her taking the time tonight. Most importantly, I want to thank both gentlewomen for sharing their stories. I thank Congresswoman KUSTER for having the courage to share her personal story, which I think will give hope and strength to women and survivors across the country. Sexual assault is an epidemic that knows no boundaries. It is a crisis on our campuses that mandates the attention of every Member of Congress.

I was in college in the late 1970s and the early 1980s, and I know what happened back then is sadly still happening today. I know of a college gang rape that happened when I was in school. I know of men who would brag about taking turns on drunk or unconscious women who could not give consent. They were not in a position to give consent. We would hear about these experiences later when a survivor was brave enough to confide in her friends about what happened on that night.

But every time, without exception, she felt powerless, with little hope that justice would be on her side if she reported the crime. That is because the rape culture is suffocating for women all across America. She knew then that they would ask her what she was wearing, was she showing cleavage, were her jeans too tight. She knew they would ask her how much she had to drink, if she were asking for it because she had a few cocktails, and she knew that they would ask about her sexual history, if she were promiscuous, if she egged him on. This is the rape culture that sexual assault survivors live through each and every day.

All of these memories came rushing back to me when I learned about the brave survivor at Stanford University. She courageously shared her vivid, graphic, and horrifying story of what happened before and after she was raped. Now, I didn't say during, because she was unconscious when she was raped behind Stanford University's dumpster.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick. I am sick and tired about this epidemic while we have meaningful legislation that sits and dies in committee. Those of us here tonight strongly support this legislation that will reform the way sexual assaults are handled on our college campuses. But where is the movement? Where is the vote on this floor of this Congress? The silence and the inaction from Congress is deafening and appalling.

For example, the Campus Accountability and Safety Act only has 34 cosponsors. That is right, 34 cosponsors out of 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Just as troubling is the HALT Act, the HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act, which has only one Republican cosponsor—I repeat, one Republican cosponsor.

And why I bring that up is because rape is not a partisan issue. It does not have a label of Republican or Democrat on it. Rape victims are not Republicans; they are not Democrats. They are human beings, and they deserve better. At bare minimum, they deserve a hearing and a vote on this floor of Congress.

Let me just say this. If women made up more than our measly 20 percent of Congress, if Congress truly reflected the makeup of America, where 50-plus percent of Americans are women, I guarantee that sexual assault wouldn't be a back-burner issue because this has impacted all of us: our friends, our sisters, our daughters. They have lived this experience.

As a woman in Congress, I will not stay silent because why be Congresswomen if we can't help other women and do so vigorously and boldly? I will not stay silent while one in five college women experiences sexual assault during her undergraduate years. As a woman in Congress, I will not stay silent because every female staffer I work with knows of a woman who was raped in college.

How many more college women will be raped before Congress will act? We are here tonight for Emily Doe, who was sexually assaulted behind that fraternity dumpster while she was unconscious. We are all here for all survivors because we see you, we hear you, we respect you. As women Members of Congress, we will amplify your voice until there is action. Let me be clear. We will not be silent until meaningful action is taken. We will continue to challenge the status quo so all survivors are given the adequate justice they deserve.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BUSTOS and Representative CLARK. There were others who planned to join us, but because of the weather, their flights were not able to land. With these stories, we hope to show that Emily Doe is not alone and, in fact, we are all Emily Doe.

These types of experiences happen to every type of woman across the country—not just students, not just young women—mothers, daughters, teachers, and, yes, even Members of Congress. And that is why we must all come out of the shadows and the silence and demand action be taken to put an end to the victimization of women and other individuals by their abusers.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, we want to speak to America to say: we will be silent no longer. We hear you. We hear the stories of the survivors. And we plan to make this Congress take the action that needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1270, RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Ms. KUSTER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–638) on the resolution (H. Res. 793) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by

the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5485, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Ms. KUSTER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–639) on the resolution (H. Res. 794) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a family event.

Mr. DUFFY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of travel delays.

Ms. HAHN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather-delayed flight.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2736. An act to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 337. An act to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 22, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5456. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home, to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5388. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5389. A bill to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; with an amendment (Rept. 114–631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT. Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5538. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2538. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5447. A bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements; with an amendment (Rept. 114–634, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. House Resolution 737. Resolution condemning and censuring John A. Koskinen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; with an amendment (Rept. 114–635, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4921. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, to require the maintenance of certain records for 3 years, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 1550. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114–637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 793. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements (Rept. 114–638). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 794. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–639). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5447 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 5537. A bill to promote internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income contributions to the capital of a partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 5540. A bill to establish a fair and transparent process that will result in the timely consolidation, closure, and realignment of military installations inside the United States and will realize improved efficiencies in the cost and management of military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 5541. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to establish procedures for Federal credit unions to provide credit union services to underserved areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5542. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a comprehensive and nationwide system to evaluate the quality of care provided to beneficiaries of Medicaid and the Children's

Health Insurance Program and to provide incentives for voluntary quality improvement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 5543. A bill to prioritize educating and training for existing and new environmental health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5544. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transfer of a firearm to a person whose name is in the Terrorist Screening Database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 5545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the application of certain rules with respect to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5546. A bill to preempt State laws preventing a major city from regulating firearm-related conduct in the city that occurs in or affects interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5547. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for increased price transparency of hospital information and to provide for additional research on consumer information on charges and out-of-pocket costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 5548. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to sell Pershing Hall; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 5549. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make marijuana accessible for use by qualified medical marijuana researchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 5550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on United States dollar clearing done for the benefit of Iran or Iranian persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5551. A bill to require advance appropriations for the expenditure of any funds collected by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5552. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish an exemption from a rule or regulation to regulate payday loans, vehicle title loans, or other similar loans for certain States and Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5553. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require fines collected for violations of the rules of the Municipal Rulemaking Board to be deposited into the Treasury and to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to remove a requirement on the use of certain funds; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5554. A bill to require the Comptroller of the Currency to transfer administrative jurisdiction over the old Office of Thrift Supervision building to the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H. Res. 795. A resolution recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the Fulbright Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 5538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''to provide for the common Defense'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 5541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.''

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 5542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 5543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3. Within the Enumerated Powers of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the power to lay and collect taxes. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, section 8, clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 5550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: ''The Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer therof.''

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 169: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 225: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 258: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 391: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 465: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 532: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 539: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 563: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 670: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 711: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 729: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 735: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 829: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 969: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1076: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SABLAN and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1192: Ms. HAHN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 1211: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1221: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1311: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1343: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1559: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1586: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1706: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1736: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1763: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1858: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1865: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1941: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2035: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2142: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2237: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2254: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2315: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2380: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2493: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2515: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2519: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2612: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2622: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2646: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 2713: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2726: Mr. SALMON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2737: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2903: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2963: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2994: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3012: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3051: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3095: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3151: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 3178: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3179: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3222: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 3268: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 3356: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3381: Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3514: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3520: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3546: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 3720: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3815: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3870: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3936: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3957: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 4019: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4062: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4140: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 4177: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4214: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 4219: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4247: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4276: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4362: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 4365: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4380: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4381: Mr. COOK and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4399: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4479: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4514: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 4525: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4592: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BLUM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 4613: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4626: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4640: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4646: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4667: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4695: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4763: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4764: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 4766: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4769: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 4770: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 4828: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 4848: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4907: Ms. MOORE and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 4918: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4927: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4931: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4956: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 4959: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4980: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 5001: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 5061: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5082: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5119: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 5133: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5165: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5166: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5168: Mr. HONDA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 5177: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5180: Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 5204: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5207: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5210: Mr. PERRY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 5219: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5230: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 5235: Mr. HONDA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 5249: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5292: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 5295: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 5307: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5332: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5356: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 5447: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5456: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5457: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 5475: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 5483: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 5484: Mr. COOK and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5486: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5488: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5499: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 5500: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5504: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS,

Ms. LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5506: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 5513: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 5523: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. REED, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5525: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 5528: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 5529: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 5531: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H. Res. 12: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Res. 28: Ms. MOORE and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Res. 62: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 94: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 230: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H. Res. 289: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 605: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 686: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 728: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 729: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOHO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. NEAL.

H. Res. 739: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H. Res. 750: Mr. COOK, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 752: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 755: Mr. MASSIE and Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 769: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VELA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 782: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. KNIGHT.

H. Res. 789: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. NORCROSS.